





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2017 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/princetonseminar6521prin>

# The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. LXV

DECEMBER 1972

NUMBER 2

Donald Macleod, Editor

Edward J. Jurji, Book Review Editor

Excerpta et Commentaria: Editor

The Faith of John Knox	<i>James I. McCord</i>	16
The Life Line of Theology	<i>George S. Hendry</i>	22
The Minister as a Guidelines Writer	<i>Seward Hiltner</i>	31
The Only Sin	<i>Frederick E. Sontag</i>	38
Tears and Elie Wiesel	<i>John R. Roth</i>	42

Sermons:

No Faith No Church	<i>Ernest T. Campbell</i>	49
The Spectacular in the Unspectacular	<i>Henry S. Gehman</i>	54
The Christian's Joy	<i>William H. Felmeth</i>	60
Is Judas a Scapegoat?	<i>Stuart G. Leyden</i>	66
Fleeting Glimpses	<i>Donald R. Purkey</i>	69
Can the Pulpit Recover Its Authority?	<i>John R. Brokhoff</i>	73
Hermann Kutter: Pioneer Social Theologian, 1863-1931	<i>János Pásztor</i>	80
Poem: The Glory of the Cross	<i>Gideon G. Scott</i>	88

Occasional Papers:

The Preacher's Syndrome—A Ministerial Malaise	<i>John R. Gray</i>	91
Faith and Tolerance: An Introductory Investigation	<i>Lawton W. Posey</i>	93
Each in His Own Native Language	<i>Edward M. Huenemann</i>	95
Who Is the Seminarian?	<i>Hugh T. Kerr</i>	100

BOOK REVIEWS:

Theological Dynamics, by Seward Hiltner	<i>James D. Smart</i>	108
Change in the Church, by Robert C. Worley	<i>Arthur M. Adams</i>	109
An Introduction to Contemporary Preaching, by J. D. Baumann	<i>Donald Macleod</i>	110
20 Centuries of Great Preaching, ed. by C. E. Fant & W. M. Pinson		110
The New World Idea Index to the Holy Bible, ed. by H. K. Griffith		111
A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship, ed. by J. G. Davies		112
Ask Me to Dance, by Bruce Larson		112
The Future Shape of Preaching, by Thor Hall	<i>Laurence H. Stookey</i>	113

The Integrity of Worship, by Paul W. Hoon	114
A Colloquy on Christian Education, ed. by J. H. Westerhoff	<i>E. G. Homrighausen</i> 115
Reason, Faith and Love, by Joseph E. McCabe	117
The Gospel in a Broken World, by John H. Snow	117
Bare Ruined Choirs: Doubt, Prophecy and Radical Religion, by Garry Wills	119
My Brother Paul, by R. L. Rubenstein	<i>Charles T. Fritsch</i> 120
Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Kittel), ed. by G. Friedrich	<i>Bruce M. Metzger</i> 121
Concordia Bible with Notes: New Testament, ed. by M. H. Franzmann	121
The Authority of the Bible, by Donald G. Miller	<i>Edwin H. Rian</i> 122
Robert Newton Flew, 1886-1962, by G. S. Wakefield	<i>Norman V. Hope</i> 123
The Validity of the Christian Mission, by Elton Trueblood	123
Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition, by Henry Chadwick	<i>Robert S. Beaman</i> 124
Book Notes	<i>Donald Macleod</i> 126

## THE ANNUAL LECTURESHIPS

1972-1973

*The L. P. Stone Lectureship*

January 29-February 1, 1973

DR. IVAN ILLICH

*Center of Intercultural Documentation  
Cuernavaca, Mexico*

*The Annie Kinkead Warfield Lectureship*

April 23-26, 1973

DR. PAUL RICOEUR

*John Nuveen Professor  
The Divinity School, University of Chicago*

# Excerpta et Commentaria

by the EDITOR

## *Baccalaureate at Sunrise*

Baccalaureate services in academic institutions are passing through a period of doubt and questioning. In some cases their format has been radically altered; in others, they have been abandoned altogether. What would you think, however, of a baccalaureate service held *outside at seven o'clock in the morning*? On May 21, 1972, Oberlin College in Ohio, with Professor of Religion, Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., as preacher, chose this new time and situation to underscore a remnant of significance in what has been a long and honorable tradition.

"A baccalaureate service," began Professor Long, "is intended as an occasion for the community of learning to take stock of its aims and to examine the purposes to which it is called." Traditionally the address was given by the president who took it as an occasion "for setting the tone of the institution which he was charged to lead." Gradually, however, outside speakers were invited and as a result the concerns of the local situation were left out and the speeches became exercises in religious generalities and irrelevance. "Baccalaureate," said Dr. Long, "became a bore." Other factors also conspired in its demise: the attempt to shorten commencement activities; deference to our pluralistic society in which "this religious stuff" ought to be voluntary; and pressure to choose some other means as "a ritual of corporate identity." This new experiment—a "sunrise baccalaureate"—was projected either as "the last encampment on the way to permanent exile or a temporary sojourn in the wilderness prior to the return of prophetic proclamation."

The current dis-ease over baccalaureates is in Professor Long's opinion "a pale reflection of the uncertainty we feel about all aspects of contemporary experience." None of us can identify these changes as being either "instrumentalities of death or channels to new life." The winds of change, to use Harold Macmillan's phrase, have in Long's words become a gale. "The sails are full," he says, "but who knows whether the ship is headed for a port or to be destroyed on rocky shoals?" What is most serious, moreover, is "there is no captain. The crew has opted for autonomy and they all read the sextant differently."

In an academic institution, such as Oberlin (and its situation is legion), these changes have accomplished a subtle, yet basic, transformation in the educational arena. Freedom and flexibility have been granted at the price of the erosion of excellence. "Our record to date," the speaker said, "is characterized more by what we have abandoned than by what we have created." Often the result has been to doubt "the meaning of the educational process itself." Indeed, "never have so many people wondered whether being here is worthwhile."

But neither the present nor the future is incurably dark. Professor Long rejoices in the evidences of students caring as deeply and vibrantly as they do about "their stake in the academic enterprise." Few generations of students have been more ready and willing "to be counted." What he regrets, however, is the polarized anger that issues from those who deplore the slowness of change and from those who feel too much is being forfeited too quickly. "So little do most people know where we are going that many of them have ceased to ask, and some have ceased even to realize that they have ceased to ask," he observed. This blurring of goals and purposes has resulted in preoccupation with iconoclasm rather than creativity, with copping-out rather than prophetic encounter, with moods of truculence rather than confessions of inadequacy, with blaming others while overlooking "the shortcomings of the self." "Obsessed with discontent," he added, "men cease to worship, not because conviction is an affront to their rationality, but because worship threatens the truculence of the angry self. Before God it is impossible to attribute all the wrongs to the other fellow."

All this is not to say—and Professor Long realizes it—that a reinstatement of the baccalaureate service to a central place in the commencement would be a cure to our ills. Religious exercises alone cannot "reconstitute the spirit of a culture." We are not, he pointed out, in our present situation "because we have given up public worship; we have given up the celebrations of relationship to a transcendent ground because we are in our present state." Mere moral concern, he feels, is only a short-term answer. "Ours is not the first generation," he stated, "to suppose that ethics provides the platform which can unite men without raising troublesome issues of world view and conviction. If, however, we take our moral impulses seriously and are spared that arrogant blindness that turns partisanship into idolatry and good causes into crusades, we shall find ourselves again impelled to pause together before the divine throne of mercy both to acknowledge our shortcomings and to cultivate those qualities of compassion without which the relationships between men—even between rational men—are poisoned by the coldly calculated pursuit of merely programmatic agendas or foot-dragging opposition to them."

Professor Long concluded by pointing out that Moses took forty years in preparation for leading his people into a new and better life. "In our impatient arrogance we want the same consequences to inhere from just forty minutes spent in this setting" (the baccalaureate at sunrise). But such a strategy cannot and will not work, because "there is no short cut to spiritual maturity and no quick way to grow in grace." This is not to say, however, that such an enterprise is uncreative or the presuppositions upon which it is based are null and void. God and his work are not just some data for a Gallup poll. "He speaks and acts upon us in all experience," Long added. And "we are more likely to hear him if through special occasions we direct our attention to this fact." The baccalaureate service in any institution is an occasion not to be underrated. The new world of life to which each generation of graduates is dismissed can be "a little different because you have been in this 'wilderness' for a fleeting moment."

*Karl Barth Society*

Most colleges and universities have their Shakespeare societies, Dickens clubs, and *cercles Français*, but few theological seminaries feature interest groups except for little devotional enclaves which are usually parochial in personnel and esoteric in their focus. This is not meant to imply there are no heroes in the world of biblical studies or crusaders in matters ecclesiastical; it simply points to the interdisciplinary character of theological educational enterprise, in which models, saints, and slogans are held and revered as common property.

In view of this traditional situation, a rather unusual event occurred recently under the aegis of the Toronto School of Theology: a research center was inaugurated for the Karl Barth Society of North America. The society plans to acquire a complete collection of all the Swiss theologian's works—books, articles, and some forty unpublished manuscripts—and to put into permanent printed form as many of these resources as they can afford.

The Toronto School of Theology was formed four years ago through the merger on the graduate level of seven denominational seminaries—three Roman Catholic, two Anglican, one United Church of Canada, and one Presbyterian. But why Toronto for the center of Barthian research on this continent? Among the one hundred and thirty attending the inauguration ceremony, Professor Arthur Cochrane of Pittsburgh Seminary replied, "It has a central location and, moreover, the Toronto School of Theology is the most significant theological development and foremost faculty of ecumenical theology on the continent." The Toronto Barthian Society is linked with the two year old Barthian Foundation in Basel which holds in its possession forty volumes of unpublished manuscripts of this century's most famous Protestant theologian. Eventually it is the aim of the Canadian group to obtain photostatic copies of these writings and to house them in the Caven Library of Knox College. Said the librarian, David Demson, "We're not trying to make it into a little spooky section in a museum, but in the middle of what's going on, we want to make it all available to theologians and graduate students who will come here."

The inauguration ceremonial featured as guest speaker, Professor Paul Lehmann of Union Theological Seminary, New York, whose incredible statements drew this headline in Toronto's leading newspaper, "Theologian Likens Hitler's Germany to Nixon's U.S.A." Apart from the irresponsibility of his remarks and the slight to the traditional British sense of fair play, namely, that one does not criticize the government of his own country when on foreign soil, the thrust of Dr. Lehmann's address is tempered by the fact that he could deliver himself in this way and yet return freely to his native land. He said, in part: "Perhaps the time is coming, is actually here, when Canada and her churches and theologians will be called to be to the United States as the United States was to Germany from 1930 to 1945: a refuge and strength in the confessional struggle for the freedom of the Gospel and the humanity of human beings."

Regarding Barth and the confessional struggle in Hitler's Germany, Professor Cochrane attempted to keep historical reflections in a more sensible perspective



when he said, "After the war, Barth was the leading exponent of the rehabilitation of Germany. And when the Cold War ended, Barth counseled the churches to bring reconciliation between the East and West. He warned the churches at that time not to take sides. "Moreover," Cochrane continued, "Barth changed our attitude to the Jews. Most Christians thought Jews were anachronisms because they rejected the Messiah. Barth recognized that Jews were part of the people of God, part of the community of faith, with whom God made his covenant and God never took it back."

### *Christianity and the Jews*

In the Sunday issue of *The New York Times*, December 3, 1972, George Dugan, religious news editor, under the caption "Christians' Evangelizing Alarms Jewish Leaders," remarked, "Jewish leaders are expressing alarm over the growing evangelistic efforts of Christian churches." This concern has come into sharp focus on account of certain contemporary religious movements: Key 73, a well organized evangelistic effort designed to "reach every person in North America with the gospel of Christ"; the increasing popularity of the Campus Crusade for Christ; and the Jews for Jesus appeal.

"Spokesmen for all branches of American Judaism," continued Mr. Dugan, "are cautioning their constituents to be wary of these various campaigns because of their potential threats to friendly Christian-Jewish relations carefully nurtured over the years and the possibility that they might be used for vehicles of proselytization."

Although most of these movements would disclaim any intention of directing their efforts specifically toward Jews, nevertheless Jewish leaders are concerned. Key 73 is sponsored by over one hundred denominations and groups, including theologically conservative and the more liberal Protestant bodies and some Roman Catholic dioceses. This effort is described by Dugan as "the biggest co-operative evangelistic project in the history of the Christian church." It will feature the use of mass media in a widespread evangelistic crusade and thousands of visits and Bible study sessions in the nation's homes.

The initial expression of alarm from the Jewish people came from Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, who took a dim view of "the avalanche of Christian missionary activities which has recently been launched throughout the country." Another note of concern was expressed by a leader of Reform Judaism who observed that while these evangelistic campaigns were not anti-Semitic intentionally, yet they "do seem to posit the superiority of Christianity and the centrality of Jesus." Although both leaders would acknowledge that there is here no overt attempt "to get the Jews," nevertheless these movements constitute a challenge and should be met by "a massive effort at Jewish education on the youth and adult level." Definite action appeared to be forthcoming from the American Jewish Congress with plans to supply "solid and intellectually challenging information and insights about the Jewish experience." Knowing that the Campus Crusade for Christ has a budget of \$18-million and a staff of 3,000 and that Youth for Christ has conducted evan-



gelistic campaigns in 2,000 American high schools, the Congress has solicited from their own members the names of all children, relatives, and friends who are currently on college campuses, plus financial contributions, to continue a stream of literature on Jewish life to them.

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum commented as follows upon the present movements among Christian groups: "What emerges from a careful reading of the Key 73 literature and listening to the speeches of its principal sponsors is that this 'evangelical revival' effort is based on a conception of America as 'an evangelical empire.'

"That conception, which governed the first half of the national history of America, perceived America as a 'Christian nation,' one in which Jews and other non-Christians were tolerated as less than full partners in the democratic enterprise.

"The notion of America and evangelical Christianity as being one and the same is a regression from the liberal democratic view which is grounded on the pluralistic idea that Jews, Catholics and others are full partners in American society."

What the rabbi contends is more than half true. However, Key 73 would not be able to go all the way with him without setting up finally a flasher "Exit St. Paul." Moreover, it is highly likely the latter would refuse to exit. All this calls for a review of an issue quietly shelved in these days among Christians, namely, the finality of Christ for faith. In other words, who is there to tell us of the viability of the old missionary hymn "We've a story to tell to the nations"? In modern America is pluralism the forerunner of censorship or in the realm of religious truth is discretion to be our final policy?

### *Publish and Perish*

Recently Princeton University's campus paper, *The Daily Princetonian*, featured an article entitled, "Princeton Professors Weather Publishing Crunch" and subtitled, "Manuscripts Flood Academia's Journals and Presses." The burden of the commentary was as follows: "When sudden waves of students entered graduate schools in the late 1960's, lured by fat fellowships and draft exemptions, academic career prospects looked rosy. Today, however, these students have become assistant professors trying to publish their research or perish in the tough competition for jobs." The situation at present, the article continues, is that the backlog of book manuscripts and articles has produced "perhaps the biggest crunch the academic publishing business has ever seen." The Modern Language Association, for example, has accepted articles extending into 1975 and Princeton University Press reports an increase from 400 to 750 book manuscripts received annually over against a publishing capacity of eighty-five titles a year.

Outlets other than Ivy League presses are equally cautious. The president of Charles Scribner's Sons has remarked, "It's going to be increasingly hard for a professor to get published. These days a commercial house has to restrict itself to books that are likely to pay their own way." Non-profit university presses, however, on account of their being tax free and eligible for grants from foundations, can afford to publish titles which sell less than 2,000 copies, whereas commercial paperback publishers must think in terms of an initial run of 125,000.

With libraries facing a cut-back in the number of academic books they can purchase, larger university presses are reducing their listings and smaller ones have folded. This led Professor E. Dudley Johnson of Princeton University to remark, "Certainly a young man at the outset of his career should concentrate on articles. A book is an enormous output of time on a chancy business." But what of the pressure young professors feel to publish early? Princeton University's tenured professors are more ready to caution young men against "publish *and* perish" than "publish *or* perish." Most senior professors keep close tabs on "the research progress of their staff members" and hence "tenure has never been denied because a manuscript is stockpiled for eighteen months in a major journal's backlog." What is more to be avoided, they feel, is to publish prematurely "something that later becomes an albatross."

### *Moltmann and Leisure*

A national election in the United States, Canada, or Great Britain stirs up unlimited oratory over welfare, jobs, and unemployment. All the while, theologians and religious leaders focus their sight beyond these issues and worry about what is to them a fast-approaching and far more alarming problem, namely, leisure. Labor unions and industrial magnates clash over the intricate matters of the in-put of man hours and the out-put of production, but socially sensitive Christian thinkers are more concerned with the way technology is changing the ways of human thought and life. Technology has changed the means and methods by which people do their daily work, but it is creating rapidly a new life situation which is best described by a simple question, "What shall we do with our leisure?" Already other forces have anticipated this situation and are now active. In all probability, however, their contribution will be merely to fill out our idle hours with organized schemes more baneful and mischievous than the boredom of our work.

A new voice on the European theological horizon, Jürgen Moltmann, has arisen with a sensitivity to social concerns not always typical of ivory tower thinkers. In his latest book, *Theology of Play* (Harper & Row, 1972), Moltmann deplores the fact that "people have lost their capacity for leisure; they no longer know how to do nothing since constant and full employment has become their ideal. So they have to 'do something' even with their leisure time. Having mastered their work they have to master now their leisure time as well. Leisure then becomes a continuation of the rhythm of work by other means. The leisure industry, with good business sense, helps people to find 'something to do' with their leisure. Yet those who would master their leisure merely manage to violate their own freedom. Freedom has a way of coming by itself to those who are open and receptive. Those who feel they must master it are destroying freedom even in their leisure" (p. 9).

Such thoughts have an arresting effect upon what we generally think of as a vacation. Our "achievement-centered society" considers a vacation to be a time when "we get away for a while to become better achievers and more willing workers." It is not free play, therefore, but is intended "to restore a person's fitness for coming demands." Rarely in this experience does there occur what Harvey Cox calls for in his *Feast of Fools* (Cambridge, 1969) "a festive affirmation of living

and an alternative to the daily routine of work, convention, and mediocrity." Hence Moltmann demands a "humanizing emancipation." He suggests we bring the "game" concept into our daily living. Games, however, must be wrested, he feels, from "ruling interests and changed into games of freedom." This is necessary because "games can become hopeless and witless if they serve only to help us forget for a while what we cannot change anyway" (p. 12). Hence a liberating effect must be sought after. How? "All liberation movements," says Moltmann, "begin with a few people who are no longer afraid and who begin to act differently from that expected by those who are threatening them" (p. 14).

Here he finds a link with ancient religions. Primitive tribal festivals were not an occasion to implore God's help in time of need, but "as a play of remembrance, as an expression of joy, and as the imaginative hope of man's basic and final humanity before God" (p. 58). There is a word here obviously for the modern congregation. Most of them do not know what to do with leisure and so "they fill it up with theological workshops and charitable or social activities." (And, incidentally, such activity only adds to the general contemporary confusion over the purpose of the church in the modern world.) Even Schleiermacher in his time sensed some lack of clarity in this area, for he said, "There ought to be free fellowship bound and determined by no *external* purpose." Hence Moltmann calls for a type of leisure in which "workers at rattling machines relax on crackling motorcycles and professors, who read and write books, unwind with detective stories" (p. 69).

In view of such conditions, Moltmann invites Christians to "experiment with the possibilities of creative freedom," to unloose man's "repressed spontaneity," and to encourage "productive imagination." Worship, he feels, may be a source of this new spontaneity. The old notion of "getting something out of worship" must be replaced by a new principle, "being-there-for-others." This principle is really love carried to its conclusion and resolving itself into true freedom. There is no domination of ourselves or others. *For* others becomes *with* others. A liberated zone is established where, in Augustine's words, you and I love God and do as we like. As Moltmann says, "There is the Other . . . before whom we can rejoice and play, laugh, love and dance, so that the chains fall away" (p. 113).

### *Timely Words to Universities*

The leveling off in enrollments, drop outs among sophomores and juniors, shrinkages in government and foundation grants—all these have led Professor Martin Morf of the University of Windsor to say, "It is now abundantly clear that no one loves the universities any more." He feels the public views them as "centers of dissent biting the establishment that feeds them, as institutions whose degrees no longer assure employability, and whose research merely adds to the information explosion and publication pollution." From the inside, moreover, "students are disenchanted because the job prospects of university graduates are no better than they are for anyone else. . . . Some are fed up with the proliferation of Mickey Mouse courses." None of these, Professor Morf thinks, is the real issue. "What is of concern," he declares, "is the obvious need for a drastic re-assessment of the role

of the universities and the conclusions that should emerge from such a re-assessment."

The first conclusion he projects is that "a university loses its social usefulness the moment it ceases to insist that good work can be distinguished from poor work and that meaningful standards of competence be met to qualify for a degree." Any university that fails to operate on this assumption is readily dispensable and can—and indeed should—be replaced by "a printer producing graduation certificates and mailing them out at random."

Universities generally, indeed some in particular, have felt guilty over insisting on competence. Some have thought there was something non-egalitarian in making high demands upon their students. Whereas the forces of counterculture and the devotees of Marcusian thought hinted that the urge to excel was no longer relevant. But "competence," Dr. Morf insists, "is of acute relevance in a period during which the quality of life is dropping inexorably." Technical expertise has been a popular target of the counterculture, but the problems of our age have come not from the scientists but from "greedy consumers and short-sighted governments."

The second conclusion he sees is the need of the university to instruct the whole man. Historically the responsibility of the university was limited to the area of the intellectual and "the preparing of hamburgers was left to other agencies." North American universities have suffered too long from "the grip of the sheep-skin or degree psychosis." But now is not the time for schools to abdicate their traditional mission. Universities must concentrate on the intellectual and at the same time avoid becoming elitist. Critical reading, logical thinking, clear expression are competencies that have their place in the whole business of living. The university rescinds its social value when it fails to insist upon meaningful standards in every area of endeavor. In undergraduate study programs the crux of the university's problem is seen in an internal softness regarding general competence. "They view final examination," Professor Morf observes, "as cruel and unusual punishment. Their academic year is absurdly short. Grading is regarded as an infringement of civil rights, and is left, therefore, to assistants or computers and is taken seriously by no one." What is written into undergraduate programs is important because they are either the last phase of formal education or the foundation of advanced work. Competence embraces total performance and in it both intellectual expertise and basic value judgments have a place.

### *Betjeman—New Poet Laureate*

The February 2, 1959, issue of *Time* magazine carried a news item captioned "Major Minor Poet." The write-up was occasioned by the publication of *Collected Poems* by John Betjeman which caused a rush on British bookstores unrivalled since the appearance of Byron's *Childe Harold* in 1812. Sales at the rate of 1,000 copies a day led *Time's* commentator to add, "Literary bookmakers predict that Betjeman will be England's next poet laureate." He was right, save one: actually Cecil Day Lewis was the next, but his death last May, after only four years as laureate, opened the way for Betjeman's appointment.

The office of poet laureate in England goes back to the seventeenth century and



bears considerable honor but little remuneration (\$175.00 a year). He is the personal poet to Queen Elizabeth and enters upon a distinguished lineage which includes such names as John Dryden, Ben Jonson, William Wordsworth, Alfred Tennyson, Rudyard Kipling, and John Masefield. Hitherto a laureate was expected merely to grind out odes celebrating such royal occasions as births, marriages, coronations, and military victories.

Those of us who were already acquainted with Betjeman's verse anticipate now a new chapter in the role of England's poet laureate. A break with tradition is assured, for he has determined to write about things that make him angry. He wants to "save what is left of England from demolition"; to speak against "developers and greedy property owners"; to campaign "against TV aerials and to save ancient towing canals and musty little churches"; and to be a lover not of antiquarianism but of "genuine gas-lit charm and hedge-hid privacy." As a result his verse is a mixture of sweet and sour, alternating between praise of a suburban tennis club and an attack upon suburban sprawl and those who gain and profit from it.

Born in London sixty-six years ago, Betjeman (rhymes with *fetch-a-man*) attended Oxford's Magdalen College where he disliked his tutor (C. S. Lewis) and failed to take a degree because he forgot to register for "divvers" (divinity). He worked as a schoolmaster and journalist and during World War II served with the Ministry of Information. At that time his mood was somewhere between satire and sentimentality, exemplified in this sardonic prayer:

Gracious Lord, Oh, bomb the Germans.  
Spare their women for thy sake.  
And if that is not too easy  
We will pardon thy mistake.  
But, gracious Lord, whate'er shall be,  
Don't let anyone bomb me.

His *Collected Poems* sold 125,000 copies and his biographical long poem, *Summoned by Bells*, will go higher. He was knighted in 1969. In view of the other formidable contenders for the office (W. H. Auden and Roy Fuller), Betjeman remarked with a characteristic under-statement, "I've been very lucky."

### *Ferris: Preacher and Pastor*

Preachers and teachers of preachers felt a deep sense of loss in the passing on December 3, 1972, of Theodore Parker Ferris, rector for thirty years of Trinity Church, Boston—"Phillips Brooks' Church." He was one of the truly great preachers of the American pulpit and probably the finest of this generation in the Episcopal Church. He was the author of a number of books, including *Go Tell the People* (Scribner's, 1951), *God's New Age* (Harper, 1956), *When I Became A Man* (Oxford, 1957), *What Jesus Did* (Oxford, 1963), and *The Image of God* (Oxford, 1965), and had lectured on preaching at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, for over twenty years. He brought distinction and an unusual competence to every facet of contemporary churchmanship, but where his witness had

its greatest impact was as a parish minister. Offers from universities and theological schools came to his door, but he chose to remain as leader and shepherd of a congregation where he felt his most effective contribution could be made.

On December 10, at the regular morning service in St. Bartholomew's Church, New York City, the rector, the Reverend Terence J. Finlay, paid a warm and eloquent tribute to the work and person of Dr. Ferris who had been a close friend and frequent visitor to his pulpit. He said in part, "For over fifteen years, he (Dr. Ferris) came to us as one of our noonday Lenten preachers. In that time, he made for himself a multitude of friends and admirers. Lent, for us, always seemed to be highlighted with his visit." Of his career, Dr. Finlay said, "He began his training for the ministry here at General Theological Seminary. His first post after ordination was as an assistant at Grace Church, and after some three or four years he was called to be rector of Emmanuel Church, Baltimore. Then, after five years in that post, he was invited in 1942 to become rector of Trinity Church, Boston, a church renowned for its preaching. Thus, as a comparatively young man, Theodore Ferris became rector of this very important church. On October 15 of this year, he celebrated thirty years of service there and, thanks be to God, he was able to attend and hear a close friend, Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill, say in his sermon, 'In these thirty years, he has inspired and taught thousands of people. He has not been an orator in the style of the great evangelists; rather, he has been a teacher, as in clear language he has presented, Sunday after Sunday and year after year, the eternal truths of God as revealed by Jesus Christ.'"

Of Ferris' commitment to the ministry of preaching, Dr. Finlay spoke as follows: "I realize there is a tendency in some quarters to discount preaching today. Nevertheless, if we as men of God, called by God, are not willing to preach the Good News, then we are not worth of our vocation. We are called to preach the Word of God, the truth of God, and the love of God to people, and this Dr. Ferris did with all the vigor and all the talent he possessed. St. Paul pointed out, 'How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed, and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach except they be sent?' Theodore Parker Ferris felt that he was sent by God, called by God, commissioned by God, and he lived up to that calling to the very uttermost of his being. I think what I liked most about his preaching was its constructiveness. There are some preachers who are mainly destructive. They are denouncing. He was building. He did not seek to tear down and destroy the faith and doctrine of the Church, but he sought to build, explain, and expound. He was not carried away, as some men are, by the passing fancies or the trends of the times. He believed that Jesus Christ was the same yesterday, today and forever. His sermons were phrased in simple, everyday language. Anyone could understand them. His illustrations were graphic and effective. I wish I could remember a number of them at this time, but just let me recall one to your mind. He was talking about the development of character, and how Christ sought to build character, 'We were not born with a character. We were born to grow and develop one.' He told us about meeting a very wonderful lady, and he asked her for the secret of her love and understanding and graciousness, and she replied



to Dr. Ferris, 'If you want to be a gracious old lady at seventy, you must begin at seventeen.'"

Phillips Brooks in his famous *Lectures on Preaching* called for proper balance between a minister's role as preacher and pastor. Dr. Finlay sensed this in the ministry of Dr. Ferris. "He was not only a great preacher," he said, but "he was also a wonderful pastor. He once said to his people, 'I have no family, no career as one usually thinks of a career, no money except what I earn—the salary that pays my living—but I have hundreds of human relationships with people of every walk of life, of every age, temperament, and disposition. To be a good preacher, you have to love people—all sorts and conditions of people, not just one group, one class, not people of one color, but you have to love all people because you see something of Christ in them and you realize that they are God's children.' This, Dr. Ferris did. He loved people. Everyone felt better for having him around. There have been many great preachers, but some of them have been cold and aloof out of the pulpit—not so this man. He was warm and affectionate. His friendship for you just overflowed with love and understanding. Because of his lack of family, he seemed to encircle everyone with his love."

In his little book on preaching, *Go Tell the People*, Dr. Ferris spoke out of his own experience when he said, "One sometimes hears the preaching ministry contrasted with the pastoral ministry as though one were set over against the other, unrelated to each other, competing with each other, as though one could be exercised apart from the other, whereas in fact they are both parts of a total ministry. Over and over again, preaching is the opening wedge to pastoral opportunities, and the best preaching grows out of pastoral experiences. The man who sets out to protect himself from pastoral interruptions in order to preach more effectively on Sunday soon degenerates into a prima donna. On the other hand, the man who sets out to give his people unlimited pastoral care during the week and reserves neither the time nor the energy to gather together enough food to feed them on Sunday is in danger of leading his congregation toward spiritual starvation."

### *Quatercentenary of John Knox*

John Knox died on November 24, 1572, and in Scotland and many other parts of the world his quatercentenary was observed this year with services of worship and fresh evaluations of his life and influence. From St. Giles Cathedral, Edinburgh, where the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland held a series of special services with addresses by leading churchmen and representatives from all over the world (including the Rev. James I. McCord, President of Princeton Theological Seminary) to Knox College Chapel in Toronto, Canada, where the Rev. David H. C. Read, Minister of the Madison Avenue Church, New York City, was the preacher, John Knox was—to use a caption from *The British Weekly*—"more or less remembered."

In St. Giles, the Rev. Gordon Rupp, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Cambridge, remarked, "John Knox belonged inescapably to Christ's Church Militant. His writings are full of military metaphors and trumpet is his word almost to the point of obsession. The word, however, has the merit of making us

sit up, for it is very evident that while our modern ecumenical orchestration has sounding brass and tinkling cymbals in plenty, trumpets are in short supply." It would have pleased Knox, Professor Rupp commented, to know that "after four hundred years, men would come from North, South, East and West to honor him as a great servant of God; from churches where the trumpet of the Gospel is muted and perhaps from churches only too given to blowing their own trumpet. . . . This noble church (St. Giles) has been called the heart of Scotland. While he spoke in it, it was also the conscience of the nation." This last line suggests what may be the lost note in the church of our day and could very well be the highest tribute Knox or any other churchman can ever receive.

### *And Prophets!*

A habit of our times is the attempt to capture the various features, demands and responsibilities of a movement or enterprise and wrap them up neatly in a popular slogan. This is true also of vocations and professions, especially those with a religious orientation. Originally the Christian minister was labeled "the person" (later translated *parson*), as if the authority image were the sum and substance of his vocation and service. Today we hear the somewhat innocuous term "enabler" used to describe the minister's role, as if all men of the cloth were modern St. Christophers carrying burdens across figurative rivers.

In a recent issue of "As I See It Today" (Vol. 3, No. 1, September, 1972), published by Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, that scholarly and versatile thinker, Ernest Trice Thompson, reminds us that we are called "apostles and prophets" (Ephesians 2:21-22). He states that these terms imply a backward and a forward look. The early church looked back to the foundational beliefs and works of the apostles, but did not lose sight of the prophets—the spokesmen for God—who declared his message for their own day.

"No word from the past," declares Professor Thompson, "has ever been sufficient." Jesus himself said, "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, he will lead you into all the truth." Indeed Peter, preaching at Pentecost, said, "This is what was spoken by the prophet Joel . . . your sons and daughters shall *prophesy* (without distinction of sex, Thompson notes), and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams (with no distinction in age), yea, and on my men servants and my maidservants in those days, I (God) will pour out my spirit and they (the lowly, weak and oppressed) shall *prophesy*." The church, Thompson emphasizes, is built upon "the foundation of the apostles and prophets." Both of these, he feels, are necessary and either one without the other is incomplete. The danger of relying upon the apostles alone is that "we can too easily elude God's pressing demands for the present hour." As an example, Professor Thompson cites the case of the church's role in the South in the days preceding the Civil War. "Sincere men," he said, "defended the institution of slavery on the ground that it was accepted, not condemned by the apostles. They looked backward and failed to heed the prophets who were declaring God's will for their own day."

Now, the real question is: who are today's prophets? Dr. Thompson says that each of us must "be prepared to hear and heed God's word, however, and from whomever it comes, or fail God and his service." Curiously enough, the prophet's word is not always heard initially by God's people as a whole. "It is heard only by a few, but these few become the saving remnant, the creative minority within the larger body on whom the future of the church depends. If there is no prophet to trouble our consciences, no cutting and growing edge within the church, in advance of public opinion generally, the church is in danger of dry rot and final death," he concluded. On the other hand, a church built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets "grows into a holy temple in the Lord"—to complete Paul's statement. "It grows," says Thompson, "as individuals here and there gain new moral insight or deepen their moral commitments, and as this commitment and insight are shared by other individuals, it works its way into the life stream of the church and the mass of believers is lifted up to the moral level of the pioneers—the prophets."

This can be seen, for example, in the matter of racial and social justice. Professor Thompson quotes Lucius Walker, a black churchman, who said, "Something profoundly spiritual is going on. . . . The church is becoming more eclectic, less parochial, more 'in the world.' . . . It is a long and delicate process, but when Jesus told his people to leave all they had, take up the cross and follow him, he wasn't talking about any easily disposable little cross that could be dumped when the going got rough. And I don't think the church is dumping the cross—just staggering a bit under its weight." "That," from Lucius Walker, commented the *Christian Century*, is "real testimony. The church isn't dead yet. Maybe it is just beginning to live." Returning to Paul's figure, Dr. Thompson remarks, "The church is responding slowly, too slowly, yet surely to its prophets, and so is growing into a holy temple to the Lord."

### *Stick to the Gospel, Parson!*

In his volume of poems, *What's The Use?* (Mowbray & Co., 1960), S. J. Forrest has a pertinent communications idea of recorder and encorder in mind when he wrote:

#### NEVER RIGHT

"The parsons' heads are in the clouds!  
There really is a dearth  
Of sermons that are practical  
And bring us down to earth.  
They prate about theology  
And dull dogmatic stuff,  
With mystical embellishments  
And other-worldly bluff.  
They rave about the Love of God  
To us who toil and labour;  
*Why can't they give some good advice  
On how to love your neighbour?"*

A vicar, hearing this complaint,  
Which touched him on the raw,  
Dilated on the second great  
Commandment of the Law.  
He spoke of Christian fellowship,  
And social equity;  
Of justice and of brotherhood,  
And selfless charity.  
But still his people criticized  
(He found it very odd.)  
*"Why can't he take the Good Old Book,  
And preach the Love of God?"*

(Used with permission from A. R. Mowbray & Co., The Alden Press, Oxford, England.)

# The Faith of John Knox

by JAMES I. McCORD

*Since 1959 James I. McCord has served as President and Professor of Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. A native of Texas, Dr. McCord is an alumnus of Austin College, Union Theological Seminary (Virginia), Harvard University and the University of Geneva. He is the recipient of many honorary degrees, the author of numerous articles and reviews for professional journals, and Chairman of the Department of Theology of the World Alliance of Reformed and Presbyterian Churches.*

IN late November, 1972, in Scotland's old capital, Edinburgh, the four hundredth anniversary of the death of John Knox was commemorated. Thomas Carlyle once said that Knox "is the one Scotman to whom of all others, his country and the world owe a debt." But while the place of Knox is undoubtedly established in the history of Scotland, his personality remains an enigma and his detractors in every generation outnumber his admirers. Earlier this year Knox was portrayed on Broadway as a character in Robert Bolt's *Vivat, Vivat Reginal*, a drama of the two queens Mary Stuart and Elizabeth, and his image remained the same as the public has come to expect. He was Mary's irascible opponent, a malignant spirit, somewhat crude, a loud and bombastic schemer.

There is another Knox, one with far greater verisimilitude, who will be remembered this fall. This one is primarily a preacher, one who "coveted peace, but lived and died in strife," a reformer who led the transformation of his nation and church in a single generation, a private person thrust into a public role, a Christian sustained by a warm, mystical piety that was strikingly revealed on his deathbed.

## I

It is not surprising that Knox is being officially remembered in the year of his death, for that date, November 24, 1572, is well known. The date of his birth remains uncertain, although it is now generally believed to be 1514. Almost nothing is known about his early life. Though he was long thought to have been a student at Glasgow, it is now fairly certain that he studied with John Major in the University of St. Andrews. He was ordained to the priesthood, acted as a notary in and around Haddington, the neighborhood in which he was born, and served as tutor to children of lairds in that region.

Knox first appeared on the scene carrying a two-handed sword and ready to use it in defense of George Wishart. Wishart was a gentle, peace-loving man, a "blessed martyr of God," who profoundly swayed Knox. An evangelical preacher who had been influenced by the Swiss reformation, he was betrayed and handed over to Cardinal Beaton, taken to St. Andrews, put in the dungeon, tried for heresy, and executed at the stake. He was not Scotland's first martyr for the faith, nor would he be the last, but his preaching and his deep piety were decisive in confirming Knox in the Reformed faith.



Events moved rapidly after the death of Wishart. Three months later St. Andrew's Castle was taken, Cardinal Beaton slain, and the stronghold on the North Sea was occupied by a small band. Later Knox was persuaded to enter the Castle and almost literally forced to become a preacher of the Word of God. Knox was now thirty-two. He was, in the words of T. M. Lindsay, "a silent, slow ripening man, with quite a talent for keeping himself in the background." Now the die was cast, and from the time of his first sermon, an exposition of the seventh chapter of the Book of Daniel, it was clear that the Protestant cause had a formidable spokesman, one whose voice could bludgeon and flail against the papacy and its allies, against idolatry and all else not conformable with the Scriptures. At this time it was said, "Master George Wishart spake never so plainly, and yet he was burnt: so will he be."

Knox's fate was to be otherwise. The remainder of his life was to be spent in the cause of the Reformation, and J. S. McEwen suggests that he may have lived "beyond the hour of [his] triumph, to see the inevitable tarnishing of his vision, and to grow bitter in disillusionment." But all this was ahead as Knox surrendered with the other members of the garrison and began a sentence as a galley slave, which lasted nineteen months until his release early in 1549 through the intervention of the English government. There followed a period of nearly five years as minister in Berwick, Newcastle, and London, until with the accession of Mary Tudor, "Bloody Mary," he was forced to flee for safety to the Continent, but not before castigating the crowds for the

warm welcome given the Queen when she entered London. It is common knowledge that Knox during his sojourn in England declined preferment twice, once the bishopric of Rochester and again the living of All Hallows, London, just as later he would decline appointment to superintendency in Scotland.

He remained on the Continent during the years between 1554 and 1558, save for a brief visit to Scotland in 1555, preached to the stormy congregation of Marian exiles in Frankfurt, to English refugees in Geneva, visited Bullinger in Zurich, kept in close touch with events in Scotland, and was said to have faster and more reliable intelligence in political matters than Cecil, who had a network of informers at his disposal. Without doubt Calvin's influence on Knox was powerful at this time, but modern historians such as Hugh Watt and James McEwen refuse to allow that Knox was a mere reflection of the thought of the Frenchman. Jasper Ridley insists that while "Knox took his ideas of Church organization and moral discipline from Calvin, [he] differed from him completely on the question of resistance to authority."

In May, 1557, Knox received a letter inviting him to return to Scotland. The Protestants were finally organized, the Queen Regent, Mary Guise, seemed disillusioned with the friars and was not persecuting Protestants, and the faithful whom he had left behind were prepared to "jeopard lives and goods in the forward-setting of the glory of God." Even this summons did not move Knox to leave Geneva and his congregation until more than four months later when, as he later wrote, "he could

not refuse that vocation, unless he would declare himself rebellious to his God and unmerciful to his country." He traveled as far as Dieppe, where he planned to take a ship immediately to Scotland, but here a new letter arrived with information of more recent events and with the advice that the time was not ripe for his return.

## II

It was here on the French coast, frustrated and fuming, that Knox wrote his famous manifesto, "The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women." It is this ill-advised document that has done so much to discredit Knox in the eyes of the world, just as Calvin's role in the burning of Servetus is the one event that is so often associated with his career and is used to illustrate his real character and views. "The First Blast" was aimed at Mary Tudor and Mary Guise, but unknown to Knox, Mary Tudor was dead. Elizabeth, without friends and with her legitimacy challenged, took his attack personally and never forgave the author.

Knox's outburst was a mistake. He had let his temper get in the way of his cause. When a friend criticized him for his attack, he acknowledged his error: "My rude vehemency and inconsidered affirmations, which may appear rather to proceed from choler than of zeal and reason, I do not excuse." But he added, characteristically, ". . . to have used any other title more plausible, thereby to have allured the world by any art, as I never purposed, so do I not yet purpose; to me, it is enough to say that black is not white, and man's tyranny and foolishness is not God's perfect obedience."

Knox returned to Scotland in 1559, and by this time events had moved to such a state that it has been said, "It was Knox or nothing." The nation faced civil war, the masses were unruly, and all this in what has been called "the most critical [period] in the whole history of the Reformation," 1559 to 1567. Knox's cause triumphed, and a nation was reformed, "with the suddenness of a lightning flash," in the space of fourteen months. The confrontations with Mary were to follow after the widowed queen returned from France in 1561, but the General Assembly of the Church had already begun to meet, the Scots Confession had been approved, and Knox had been settled into his congregation in Edinburgh. A decade of frustration was to ensue before his death, for the re-organization of the church had gone awry, but the tide had turned, and the Reformed faith was recognized in Scotland.

## III

No attempt had been made here to do justice to the life of this stubborn and complex man. His story has been often told, lyrically by Lord Eustace Percy more than thirty years ago and comprehensively by Jasper Ridley in a volume published in 1968, to mention only two favorite biographies. And Principal Hugh Watt's Stone Lectures, *John Knox in Controversy*, have done much to put the Scottish reformer in a more balanced perspective. But the riddle of Knox and his significance remains. Was he primarily a political leader, a precursor of revolutionaries who were to follow down to the present? Or was he first and last a preacher of the Word of God, a powerful, free-



ing Word that unleashed the new impulses of freedom that were a by-product of the church's Reformation?

Lindsay sees in the interviews of Queen Mary and Knox "the first clash of autocratic kingship and the hitherto unknown power of the people." This was "the question of questions between them," and "modern democracy came into being in that answer." Ridley similarly maintains that "Knox was one of the important theorists of modern times," who went beyond Calvin in his doctrine of resistance to rulers by placing "far more emphasis on the duty of the individual, whatever his rank, to resist evil rulers by all means at his disposal, including armed force." Ridley traces the revolutionary political philosophy of the English Puritans to the ideas of Knox.

Each generation should be reminded that an incalculable political debt is owed to Calvin and to Knox. Percy contends that the word "Reformation" is incorrectly used and has led to the writing of much bad history. "Protestantism was not a reform; it was a revolution . . . a shifting of the seat of authority." But the tendency today is to attribute far greater importance to the influence of the left wing of the Reformation in the rise of modern democracy. The writing of history is selective, written in the context of the historian and his period, and, as George H. Mead suggests, each new generation sees a different Caesar crossing the Rubicon. Perhaps today's revisionists are reflecting more accurately twentieth-century Protestantism than the movement in the sixteenth century and are reminding us that whatever revolutionary character our forebears had has

long since been lost or compromised by their descendants who have settled for a domesticated national religion.

#### IV

The key to Knox, to my mind, does not lie in his political philosophy. The major issue for him was the life and wholeness of the church, and his aim was to build up rather than to tear down. He was an exponent of the Word of God, a parish preacher, a re-builder of an ancient edifice that had fallen into disrepute and near-ruin. His work can be commemorated in 1972 without fueling the old fires of religious controversy by scoring points on medieval Roman Catholicism, since all traditions of the Christian church today face the urgent need of reform and reflect many of the problems Knox faced when he returned to Scotland. These problems are basically how can the church's confession be renewed so that she may faithfully confess the gospel in her time; how can the church be re-structured so as to be faithful to her Lord and flexible to meet the needs of the present; and how can personal faith and vital Christian experience be rekindled in the life of the people.

To each of these questions Knox addressed himself, directly to the first two, and throughout his ministry, to the third. The Scots Confession written by the "six Johns," of whom one was Knox, was completed in four days and was the response to the first. It is unmistakably sixteenth century, in harmony with earlier Reformed confessions, ecumenical and catholic in character, and warmer and more personal than the Westminster Confession that was destined to displace it in the next century. Its

Preface still cannot be read without experiencing something of the joy of its authors ("Long have we thirsted, dear brethren, to have made known to the world the doctrine which we profess and for which we have suffered abuse and danger") and of their humility ("protesting that if any man will note in our Confession any chapter or sentence contrary to God's Holy Word, that it would please him of his gentleness and for Christian charity's sake to inform us of it in writing; and we, upon our honour, do promise him by God's grace we shall give him satisfaction from the Word of God, that is, from Holy Scripture, or else we shall alter whatever he can prove to be wrong").

It is small wonder that such a document continues to be influential. It is the basis of Karl Barth's Gifford Lectures in 1938 and was included in the *Book of Confessions* of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1967. As Barth has suggested, "The confession of a church, if it was once a good confession, cannot lose its message just because it has lost its significance as a standard of the church," and the strong word of grace of the gospel continues to be the significant message of the Scots Confession for all time.

Knox and his colleagues fared less well in their attempt to re-structure the church and her institutions. A Book of Discipline was drawn up, which included a Reformed polity, but its recommendations for the use of ecclesiastical properties and endowments for educational and charitable purposes were never legally approved. Nevertheless, a democratic form of government was now installed, beginning with the kirk session, and the three medieval

universities were renewed and a fourth, Edinburgh, founded. The far-reaching vision of Knox is nowhere more evident than in the scheme for the renewal of the whole church, her government, her schools, and her ministry of mercy. McEwen in his Croall Lectures, *The Faith of John Knox*, claims that Knox's aim was to restore a eucharistic church, one sacramental as well as evangelical. Perhaps this is the clue to the breadth of his application of the Christian faith to the needs of his nation.

Evangelical and eucharistic may also be the best description of Knox's personal faith. Percy comments that "at the end of the fifteenth century the future of Christian civilization depended mainly on the answer to one question: could popular mysticism be absorbed into the life and worship of the church?" The Reformation, beginning with Luther, was unusually successful in gathering up these impulses and in channeling them into the life of the church. It was more than a reform; it was a renaissance, a new birth of spiritual experience and fervor.

To be sure, little is known of Knox's personal faith. We do not have his sermons to enlighten us. Moreover, he was a reticent man who, like Calvin, refused to unpack his spiritual bag in public, a good reason for suspecting that it was well-filled. His confidence was in Jesus Christ and His word of grace, and not in his spiritual prowess. But there is a clue to his faith, and it is found in the words directed to his wife when he was on his deathbed: "Go read where I cast my first anchor." This must have been a well known request, and she read from the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of St. John, the High Priestly Prayer, the moving language of Jesus' self-consecra-

tion and intercession for his disciples and his church. Here he had first cast anchor, in a personal relation to the living Christ.

## V

Is not this the experience people are seeking today, the new life in Christ? We are aware of the reaction that is taking place in the church and in society. Miss Iris Murdoch calls it a "stripping down of the scene." Metaphysics and theological systems are being rejected along with institutions and their programs. Credibility has become the problem everywhere. But Miss Murdoch adds that "it has also perhaps

made possible a kind of healing agnosticism, a natural mysticism, a new humility which favors clarity and plain speech and the expression of obvious and unpretentious truths: truths that are often unconnected and unhallowed by system." The church today, as in the sixteenth century, is called to re-create itself by returning to the deep and obvious and ordinary things of human existence to which the gospel of Jesus Christ is addressed. John Knox understood this, and he was able to lead such a movement from the pulpit. He was a Reformed preacher, only this and nothing more, and his genius lay in the abiding dimension where first he cast anchor.

# The Life Line of Theology

by GEORGE S. HENDRY

*A native of Aberdeen, Scotland, George S. Hendry has been the Charles Hodge Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary since 1949. A graduate of the University of Aberdeen (A.M., 1924) and the University of Edinburgh (B.D., 1927), Dr. Hendry studied also in the Universities of Tübingen and Berlin. He is the author of many articles and reviews in theological journals and of four books, including The Westminster Confession for Today (John Knox, 1960). This address was given at the opening Convocation of the 169th Academic Year of Princeton Theological Seminary.*

STUDENTS who are entering seminary now should be advised that they do so at a time when the theological enterprise is being radically called in question, not only from without—for that has always been the case—but, what is less usual and more disturbing, from within. The last two decades have witnessed a remarkable change in the mood of theology. A mood of buoyant self-confidence, bordering on euphoria, which was characteristic of the fifties, gave way in the sixties to one of mistrust and anxiety, with masochistic overtones, which lingers still. The change was comparable in some ways to a collapse of the stock market, with some of the heaviest investors in gilt-edged securities finding themselves reduced to poverty, and being driven to desperate measures to recoup their losses, even in some cases to the printing of counterfeit money.

Analyses of this change have been done by several people. One question they raise is whether it is possible to distinguish the factors which are intrinsic to theology, in the sense that they have arisen from disciplined theological reflection on its proper theme, and those that are extrinsic, in the sense that they have arisen from movements in the

general climate of culture. The distinction, of course, is difficult to make; for theology is always in interaction with the culture of the time; and this is not just an unfortunate accident, but a law of its being. This is the reason why the question of its integrity is always one of peculiar difficulty for theology. There is no clear-cut formula to which it can appeal for an answer; it must work out an answer for each new situation as it finds it. There is a rule of thumb we can use: we can listen to the dialogue between theology and culture and try to determine whether it is a continuing dialogue, or whether it has turned into a monologue, with one party dominating the conversation. But even this rule has to be applied with caution; for in any genuine dialogue there are times when it is appropriate for one party to adopt a listening role.

The question of theological integrity in the dialogue with culture assumes its most difficult form when it is related to certain trends or accents in theology, which have indigenous theological roots. How theological is the accentuation? Take, for example, the activism, which has been characteristic of recent student generations. Theological students have become increas-



ingly sensitive to the problems that trouble our society and increasingly eager to become actively involved in them—even at a time when students in secular colleges are showing much less of this disposition than they did a few years ago, a fact which may be taken to indicate that social action, though it may have been triggered in the secular world, has its own theological dynamics. I think we would all agree that, not only has action its place in the program of Christian theology, but it has rarely been given the place it should have.

It would be unfortunate, however, if this laudable emphasis should be found to harbor an unsuspected virus of anti-intellectualism. The risk is a real one, because anti-intellectualism is endemic in American life, and it tends to surface at times when the country is deeply divided over vital issues. It is a recurrent phenomenon in political elections. In a presidential election of some years ago one of the candidates ran on an anti-intellectualist platform; his slogan was, "You know in your hearts he is right," which was a way of saying that his program need not be submitted to the scrutiny of the critical intellect. The virulence was concealed behind a sense of humor, as when he suggested that the eastern seaboard of the United States, which is where the intellectuals are supposed to be concentrated, should be sawed off and dumped in the Atlantic. In recent years we have been entertained by a holder of high office in the present administration, who is skilled at turning a pungent phrase and who has aimed some of the sharpest of them at the intellectuals.

The concept of an intellectual is not native to our vocabulary, and it carries

invidious overtones. An intellectual is thought to be a person who fancies himself superior to others. But intellectualism is not a matter of being superior to other people; it is a matter of being superior to yourself. Intellect is the instrument that enables man to distance himself critically from the given. It is distinct from intelligence, which means ability to grasp and manipulate the given. Intellect looks critically at the given. Intelligence is Know-how, intellect is Ask-why.<sup>1</sup> Every manifestation of anti-intellectualism will be found on examination to be a mask for the preservation of some existing state of affairs; "Love it, or leave it"—but don't ask critical questions about it.

Now theology is an intellectual discipline. Its function is critical inquiry. And the range of that inquiry is without limits; it extends to the totality of the given. Indeed, it could be argued that the critical freedom of intellect in all the affairs of men depends on the specific endeavor of the theological intellect, and that anti-intellectualism can prevail only in a situation where theology has failed. However that may be, what makes anti-intellectualism insidious is that it usually takes the form of playing intelligence over intellect. And this can happen among ourselves. If the activist temper breeds a preference for the practical disciplines and a distaste for systematic theological inquiry, which it regards as something optional and expendable, if not positively deleterious—it may be, of course, that theology has brought this upon itself by some of the more extravagant vagaries, which

<sup>1</sup> For the distinction cf. Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1963), p. 25.

make their appearance from time to time and which, some one has suggested, recall Paul's ship after it had jettisoned its cargo and was driven "up and down in Adria." But more seriously, the persistent tendency of theology to batten on its own productions and to become scholastic raises a question whether it can be effectively related to reality. Hegel in a famous passage likened philosophy to the owl of Minerva which does not start on its flight until dusk has fallen and the day's work is done—meaning that philosophy consists of reflection on what goes on, but is powerless to direct it; Wittgenstein, in like manner, said that philosophy "leaves everything as it is." Some tend to cast theology in a similar role, and to see it as a vocation for those who are disposed to reflection, perhaps because they are indisposed to action. But that is a mistake. There is a factor in the theological situation that makes a difference, all the difference. The theological day, if I may use Hegel's figure, has something more to it than action and reflection, though that is a combination not to be disparaged; there is a third moment that comes at the dawning of the day: prayer. It is prayer that establishes the vital connection between action and reflection in theology and so lends substance to the latter.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> This might be the answer to the question that is often asked: What is the difference between philosophy and theology?—Prayer. Kant thought that a man who was accidentally discovered saying his prayers would take a red face. However, I once heard of an eminent Edinburgh lawyer who was visited early one morning by a client who insisted on seeing him; when his housekeeper knocked on the door of his room, he called out, "Dammit, woman, leave me alone, I'm at my prayers."

## II

It has become fashionable to translate theology, which is a Greek word, into its literal English equivalent, God-talk; and this is to be welcomed, because it points up the problem of theology today, in two ways: (1) It points to the fact that theology is caught in the general problem of language, which has become acute in modern times. It has been described by several people as a problem of inflation. Words are blown up and multiplied far beyond the measure of reality available to redeem them. Philosophers have been striving valiantly for half a century to curb this linguistic inflation; and while the doings of philosophers nowadays are seldom heeded outside their own coterie, it is interesting to note that the Federal Trade Commission of the United States Government has begun to apply the verification principle to advertisers. One might wish they would apply it to politicians. Inflation is a major issue in this election, but I doubt if we can anticipate any reduction in the rate of inflation, so far as political rhetoric is concerned, between now and November. Theology inevitably gets caught up in the inflationary trend, and its effects can be seen plainly in journalistic theology and promotional theology, and also perhaps in a more indirect and paradoxical way in the prevailing concern of theologian with questions of method. It is paradoxical, because a main purpose of critical methodology is precisely to curb inflation, and a stiff dose of it is salutary for theology from time to time. But it is difficult to resist the suspicion that the marked pre-occupation with methodology in contemporary theology may be a compensation for



loss of substance—to put it in William James's figure, like doing a lot of packing for a journey on which you never start. It may be pertinent to remark that God-talk is not only a Greek word, but a Greek idea. The Bible is not so much interested in talk of God as in knowledge of God. (2) The second advantage of the term, God-talk, is that it has two possible meanings: it may refer to talk of which God is the subject, the one who does the talking; or it may refer to talk of which God is the object, the one whom we talk about. The latter, of course, is the sense that ordinarily applies to theology, and it is in this sense that God-talk has become a critical issue in our time. Is it possible for us to talk of God in a way that is knowledgeable, referential, meaningful, and responsible?

The theology that lies behind us was marked by the extraordinary confidence it showed in this matter. It is all the more extraordinary, because this theology originated in a highly critical posing of the question for itself. But it overcame the crisis when it came to the position that the possibility of God-talk is contingent on the coincidence of its two meanings. Theology was defined as critical reflection on the word that God speaks, in revelation, in Scripture, and in preaching. Thus it seemed to have found for itself a safe stronghold in which it could dwell secure.

But then the fortress fell. And why? Because security is not an atmosphere in which theology can breathe. The atmosphere of theology is faith, and faith is a curious blend of security and insecurity. Luther used to describe faith in a paradoxical phrase as "confident despair." It is from the tension between

these two elements in faith that the theological inquiry arises.

For this reason I think the tendency, which is observable today, to make faith, rather than the Word, the starting point of the theological inquiry is to be welcomed. Of course, it is not a new thing; indeed, it might fairly be described as a return to the main current of modern theology. But if it has been chastened by its temporary obscuration, it cannot divorce itself from a theology of the Word and force us to make a choice between that and a theology of faith. If in the judgment of each other one tends to give too much, and the other too little, then it would seem the truth lies somewhere in between, in some position that combines the strengths of each, and avoids the weaknesses of each. Now that sounds like a compromise, and like all such, it is suspect. But I submit that there is one act of faith which cannot be understood theologically without placing us precisely in such a position. I mean prayer. If word and faith are the twin poles of theology, prayer is the current that maintains their polarity.

### III

For some time I have employed a simple device in forming a judgment on the systematic writings of theologians, new and old. I read what they have to say about prayer. It provides a significant clue. There are three things I look for.

1. I look to see how much space the theologian devotes to prayer. Not that the amount of space is important in itself, but it serves as an index of how seriously the theologian takes the subject. And if he takes prayer seriously, I

take him seriously, even if I am not able to agree with him in everything. I am disappointed with the theologian who disposes of the subject briefly with a few commonplace observations or pious platitudes. I am impatient of those who omit the subject altogether (a group which contains some surprising names). And I am ambivalent toward those who show a serious concern to attach some real significance to prayer, but who reduce it to the practice of the presence of God or to some kind of sensitivity training.<sup>3</sup>

2. I look to see whether the theologian thinks of prayer as an act of the individual wrestling with his lot in face of the mysterious workings of providence, or as an act of the community of Christ arising out of their faith in Christ. It has been customary for so long to treat prayer as a problem of apologetics or philosophy or religion and to formulate it in terms of the individual pitting his

<sup>3</sup> Bishop John Robinson quotes Malcolm Boyd's view that prayer is "not so much talking to God" as "just sharing his presence." He himself says that the popular view of prayer as talking to God, *as if* he were a person, may help the imagination, but, if taken literally as a definition of prayer, it becomes a means of escape from the real world. "The essence of prayer is opening ourselves to the grace and claim of the unconditional as it meets us in, through and under the finite relationships of life." (*Exploration into God*, Stanford University Press, 1967, pp. 123ff., 139). The chapter on prayer, from which these quotations are taken, is entitled "The Journey Inwards." "Sensitivity training" is the description of prayer given by John Macquarrie in *Paths in Spirituality* (Harper & Row, New York, 1972), according to a review in *The New York Times Book Review*, August 27, 1972. The reviewer also quotes (without page reference): "To pray is to think in such a way that we dwell with reality, and faith's name for reality is God."

will against nameless powers, that many theologians seem incapable of seeing it in any other way. I am not suggesting that that is not a genuine aspect of prayer. But I submit that in Christian theology prayer should be understood first as the act of the community of faith, in which that faith comes to its most characteristic expression. In other words, a Christian theology of prayer has to begin with the Christological fact (a fact which, however, has seldom received its due weight in Christology) that Jesus prayed, and we are invited to join with him in his prayers. It is only as people who have heard that invitation and learned to join with him in saying "Our Father" that we may retire—without breaking the circle of faith, each into his closet and pray to his Father who is in secret. The priority of common prayer in the community of faith was put rather forcefully by Jesus when he said, "If two of you agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven" (Matt., 18:19).

3. I look to see what the theologian says about prayer as petition. For prayer is basically petition—asking, seeking, making requests. Of course, it is not all petition; there are other things—adoration, confession, thanksgiving, and so forth. But if these elements are so enlarged as to crowd out petition, prayer is denatured; for petition is the heart of prayer. This is the crucial point.

There are some who say that prayer is at heart communion with God, and its truest form is mystical prayer, which abjures petition for specific gifts and seeks rather, as Tillich puts it, "to reunite the creature with its creative ground." Tillich described prayer as

"the elevation of the heart, namely, the center of the personality to God," and he cautioned, "If it is brought down to the level of a conversation between two beings, it is blasphemous and ridiculous."<sup>4</sup> In another place he associated prayer with contemplation, and he suggested "that every serious prayer (should) lead into an element of contemplation, because in contemplation the paradox of prayer is manifest, the identity and non-identity of him who prays and him who is prayed to."<sup>5</sup>

In contrast to Tillich, Gordon Kaufman holds that the relation of person to person provides the best "model" for the relation of man to God, and speaks of prayer as the language which is "the very stuff" of the relation. But in spite of this, he too balks at petition, which he describes as a magical conception, predicated on a mythological view of the world. He writes: "When it is genuinely Christian, deliberate prayer may help to bring the condition and task of the believer to an intense focus which frees him from bondage to his own desires, that he may become the vehicle of God's purposes."<sup>6</sup>

A very similar interpretation is offered in a recent statement on prayer issued by the Commission on Christian Doctrine of the Church of England under the name of Bishop Ian Ramsey. I quote from the concluding summary: "In it (prayer), we first focus our thoughts both on to God and on to some particular aspect of the world or some concern we have, intending that these should take us into a moment of vision—a moment of silence, perhaps—

where God discloses himself in the context of our prayer. Then, secondly, there follow the consequences of this activity on God's part, one of which should be our own particular response and dedication."<sup>7</sup> This statement illustrates a widespread and persistent tendency, which is to take a number of important ingredients of prayer, add them up, and say, That is prayer.

I know of no theologian of modern times, who has given more serious attention to prayer than Karl Barth. (I should qualify that and say, no Protestant theologian; among Catholic theologians, who all take prayer seriously, Karl Rahner has probably exceeded Barth in his writings on prayer). Barth introduces prayer at a number of places in his *Dogmatics* and he discourses on it at length and with unction. Moreover, he recognized that prayer is unequivocally (as it is etymologically) petition, and he strove to give a real value to petition, and not to allow it to be engulfed in thanksgiving, or devotion, or penitence. He described prayer as "a creaturely movement (which) acquires a share in the universal lordship of God." That is to say, by prayer man participates in the divine control of the course of events. But having brought us to this point, Barth falters. For is it conceivable that any creature, be he man or Christian, should really share in the lordship of God? And is it conceivable that God should relinquish any share of his universal lordship? No, both are inconceivable. How then? Why should we pray? Barth falls back on an answer Luther sometimes gave to the question: Because we are commanded. This is how the Christian acquires a share in

<sup>4</sup> *Systematic Theology* I, p. 127.

<sup>5</sup> *Op.cit.* III, p. 192.

<sup>6</sup> *Systematic Theology* (Scribner's, New York, 1968), pp. 511ff.

<sup>7</sup> I. T. Ramsey, *Our Understanding of Prayer* (SPCK, London, 1971), p. 25.

the universal lordship of God—"simply by believing, by obeying, and finally and supremely by praying."<sup>8</sup> Prayer dissolves into faith and obedience.

#### IV

In an essay published after his death, Professor Joseph Haroutounian propounded the suggestive thesis that faith is fundamentally expostulation with God, and that theology is necessary in order to keep the expostulation alive and intelligent and human.<sup>9</sup> *Human*—because (and here he makes a point which should be heeded by those who use the model of interpersonal relations for the understanding of God and man) it is the nature of man to argue with his fellows about their common concerns, and to deny him the right to argue with God about their common concern, which is reality, is dehumanizing: it "shames the believer into shutting his mouth, and man with his mouth shut is hardly a man."<sup>10</sup> Haroutounian is highly critical of theologies which foster a conception of faith as unquestioning trust in God, or which direct it to a God beyond God—How, he asks, can you have traffic with a God beyond God unless you are man beyond man? "If talking and listening are being human, together with eating and sleeping, then, if man did not talk to his God and expect to be heard, he would be acting as less than human."<sup>11</sup>

Haroutounian refers only casually to petition, but it is clearly implied in what

he says; for petition is a form of expostulation, or, to use a shorter word, a form of protest with God about reality. And to protest is human. Man is by nature a protestant; he is a protestant against his fellowmen about conditions for which they are responsible, and he is a protestant against God about conditions under which he and his fellowmen are fellow sufferers. This protestant prayer is not only human, but in an odd way, the author suggests, it proves the existence of God; for, when a man is expostulating about reality, "he knows that God exists because he is in controversy with him."<sup>12</sup>

This view of faith may seem somewhat eccentric. It is evidently modeled on the faith of Job, and Job is hardly a typical representative of Biblical faith. Still, Job is there in the Bible, and he must be understood in context. In the same way, I suggest, Haroutounian's argument, which appears over-dependent on an anthropological premise, has a hidden (or partly hidden<sup>13</sup>) theological premise. Man is certainly a protestant. But there is a weightier premise. It is that God is the original protestant. The mission and ministry of Jesus Christ is one sustained protest, or expostulation of God with man, incarnated in man's expostulation with God, which reaches its climax in the prayer of agony in Gethsemane and the cry of dereliction on the cross. And the kingdom of God, which he came to announce, is a kingdom that has to be sought, from the human side, not only by faith and obedience, but in that self-same prayer which includes our human

<sup>8</sup> *Church Dogmatics* III/3, p. 285.

<sup>9</sup> "Theology as Critique of Expostulation" in *The Future of Empirical Theology*, ed. by B. E. Meland (University of Chicago Press, 1969).

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 332.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* p. 325.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* p. 339.

<sup>13</sup> Haroutounian alludes to it once or twice, but he does not develop it as he does the anthropological premise.



needs. Prayer is the authentic expression of faith in Christ. Christian prayer corresponds to the pattern of the Christological dogma, with its dual assertion of unity and distinction; it has a polarity, which it is precisely the function of theology to maintain.<sup>14</sup>

That is why prayer is a clue to a theology. If theology dissolves the polarity, or collapses one pole into the other, prayer is resolved into either an interior monologue, or a mystical ecstasy, if it is not eliminated altogether. These are, of course, the extremes. But there is a more common way. If theology seeks to preserve the polarity, by subordinating one pole to the other, as it has often done in the classical tradition, both Catholic and Protestant, this leaves room for faith, but prayer is emasculated by it.

The issue can be posed in terms of a very simple question, so simple that it may sound trivial: When to say Amen? I read recently a book by an eminent Roman Catholic theologian in which he was attempting to explain the meaning of faith to a general audience. He pointed out that the Hebrew word, Amen, comes from the same root as the word, Emunah, which is used to denote both the faithfulness of God and the faith of man that is responsive to it; so faith is just saying Amen to God. Fine. But, of course, we say Amen at the end of our prayers. We don't begin with it. Prayer begins in a different way; it begins, as Paul puts it, with the cry, Abba, Father; and between the Abba, Father, and the Amen, there is an interval. It is in that interval that genuine prayer takes place.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Karl Rahner, *On Prayer* (Paulist Press, N.Y., 1968), pp. 63f.

How long should the interval be? How long should our prayers be? Karl Barth recommended that prayer should be short. An opinion poll on the question, Should prayers be long or short, would no doubt show a majority agreeing with him—if not for the same reason. He said, prayer should be short because it is assured of being heard.<sup>15</sup> It sounds like a good reason. But does the conclusion follow? At all events, it stands in marked contrast to a motif which appears in Jesus' teaching on prayer, especially in some of the parables on prayer which Luke has preserved, the parable of the friend at midnight (Lk. 11:5-10) and the one called the parable of the unjust judge—or mis-called, I should say, for the judge is a minor figure beside the woman who plays the lead role (Lk. 18:1-8). These parables sound a warning against short prayers—even though there might seem to be good reason for them. Take the second: here we have a litigant seeking justice, and a judge who is appointed to administer justice—surely all the conditions needed to ensure a short proceeding and a speedy Amen. But it did not work out that way; for this judge (who should not be taken for God—this is a parable, not an allegory) was a tough character, who would not be pushed by anyone, least of all a woman, and he refused to hear her plea. But she was not one for short prayers; she went on, and on, and on, until the judge thought she would never come to the Amen, and at last he was constrained to help her get there. And, said Jesus, will not God vindicate his elect who cry to him *day and night*? But then he added the ominous question, perhaps

<sup>15</sup> *Church Dogmatics* III/4, p. 112.

the most ominous question in the NT: "When the Son of man comes, will he find faith on earth?"

The same paradox is reflected in some of the things Paul says about prayer. Why pray? Because God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts crying, Abba, Father (Gal. 4:6). That seems to make it all easy, and swift. But no; for when we begin, we don't know how to do it. We cry—this is Paul's word for the language of prayer, crying (*kra-zein*, Rom. 8:5)—as Tennyson wrote:

"An infant crying in the night,  
An infant crying for the light,  
And with no language but a cry."

But no, it is not infantile crying; it is not the crying that comes before we can talk; it is a crying that comes after talk. Here I am bound to dissent from Wittgenstein's famous dictum: "Whereof one cannot speak, thereon one must

be silent."<sup>16</sup> There are two possibilities Wittgenstein overlooked. When you reach the limit of the speakable, you need not be reduced to silence, perhaps you can sing—or you can cry. That is the crying Paul speaks of in these texts. It is a crying that goes beyond talk, and beyond God-talk. But it does not destroy God-talk. On the contrary, it is precisely this crying of prayer that makes God-talk both necessary and possible: necessary, because it is the main function of theology to prevent God from being reduced to the measure of the talkable (talkability, like any receptacle we frame for God, assumes the shape of a coffin), and possible, because without prayer theology will founder on the rocks. Prayer is the life line of theology.

<sup>16</sup> *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (Kegan Paul, London, 1922), 189.



# The Minister as a Guidelines Writer\*

by SEWARD HILTNER

*An alumnus of Lafayette College and the University of Chicago (B.D. and Ph.D.), Seward Hiltner has been Professor of Theology and Personality at Princeton Theological Seminary since 1961. From 1938 to 1950, Dr. Hiltner served as Executive Secretary of the Department of Pastoral Services of the Commission on Religion and Health and the Commission on Ministry in Institutions of the Federal Council of Churches. He was for eleven years Professor of Pastoral Theology and Chairman of the Field of Religion and Personality at the University of Chicago. A widely known writer, Dr. Hiltner has published over 200 articles in the field of religion and psychiatry and is the author of ten books, including *Ferment in the Ministry* (Abingdon, 1969).*

As any of you know who have read my book *Preface to Pastoral Theology* (Abingdon, 1958), I am very much in favor of retaining some of our ancient metaphors about ministry, especially that of the shepherd, even though we have moved out of an agricultural society and into an industrial and technological age. At the same time, however, some new metaphors for ministry may be of great help. They may sharpen some ideas that tend to remain cloudy in the analogies and images of the past, and they may be effective reminders that our own ministry is in the present, in this age, and in these circumstances.

I propose the modern metaphor of the minister as a guidelines writer or preparer. *Guidelines* is a modern term. It replaces the older terms "directions," or "instructions," and the still older term "rules." The older words carried authoritarian overtones. Do it this way

and not that way. The reader was told rather than consulted. The intention of guidelines is to get the reader into consultation. If the reader wants to accomplish a certain result, and the writer knows of three routes to such an outcome, then the guidelines explain all three ways of going about it—letting the decision up to the reader as to which of the routes, if any, he will choose. *If* is a very important notion in guidelines writing. *If* the reader wants to accomplish such and such, *THEN* the guidelines offer suggestions about ways to proceed. But there is little or no argument that the reader must, or should, want such achievements. Indirectly, of course, a guidelines writer may also be a propagandist. If he spends time and energy on finding out and explaining how to achieve a certain goal, he is putting a positive evaluation on such an aim. But he writes so that the reader, at every step, may conclude, if he wishes, that he does not want to go to all that trouble.

Guidelines are about "how to," and thus they are perhaps peculiarly Amer-

\* Commencement Address delivered at New Brunswick Theological Seminary, May 18, 1972. Reprinted here with the permission of the editors of *The Reformed Review*.

ican. But in addition to their concentration on "how to," they never forget the *IF—IF* the reader wants to achieve a particular objective. Guidelines are to be taken seriously only by persons already committed to particular goals. If some other persons are not committed to these goals, perhaps they should be so persuaded by someone, but not by guidelines writers. Thus, the task of guidelines writers is to clarify everything possible about the procedures in moving from intention to consummation.

Guidelines can be, and have been, written about any conceivable kind of human activity: growing flowers, sexual relationships, writing novels, praying, building dams, enjoying music, learning new languages, laying bricks, playing the violin, selling products, doing the income tax, and so on *ad infinitum*.

From one point of view that is not exhaustive, the whole corpus of Paul's letters may be seen as providing guidelines to new Christians in the Mediterranean world. Like modern guidelines writers, Paul asks the Christian people at Corinth, "For what have I to do with judging outsiders? Is it not those inside the church whom you are to judge?" (I Cor. 5:12, R.S.V.).

The passage that has been chosen for our Scripture,<sup>1</sup> however, deals with Paul's conception of his role in offering the guidelines, which goes on for several pages in his first letter to the Christians at Corinth. The key passage in terms of his self-identity as a guidelines writer is this, "For though you have countless guides in Christ, you do not have many fathers. For I became your father in Jesus Christ through the

gospel" (I Cor. 4:15). This is equally a statement by Paul about the authority from which he speaks, and an acknowledgment that the Corinthian Christians have to reflect on it for themselves and decide whether they want an authoritative guidelines writer. Later in this passage, it becomes clear that Paul is going to come around and check up, but his whole argument presupposes that the Corinthian group wants to be faithful to Jesus Christ, and will at least take seriously Paul's interpretation of what that loyalty may mean in actual living.

It is astonishing to me when I re-read Paul in light of modern guidelines ideas how many of his epistolary discussions fall under this heading rather than under rules, directions, or instructions. Such a stance about Paul helps me to better understand not only the incompleteness of many of his comments but also the limits of his intention in making the comments. Just a bit later in his first letter to the Corinthians, for instance, he comes to a tough question, and admits straight out that, on this matter, "I have no command of the Lord" (I Cor. 7:25). He might have pulled rank at this point, but he did not do so. I am not alleging that Paul always followed the guidelines image alone. But I do assert that, when I approach him from the guidelines angle, I am astounded at how much of his writing falls under this heading.

It happened by chance that the invitation to me to present this commencement address coincided with my acquisition of a radial arm saw for my carpentry work. For eleven years previously I had been mooching on such a saw owned by my colleague, W. J. Beeners, and had learned something about using it. But there was much that

<sup>1</sup> I Corinthians 4—R.S.V.

I had not learned. Bill Beeners has another kind of precision saw on which he learned first; and hence, when the tough carpentry jobs came up, he was inclined to use the other saw rather than the radial arm. So I had a lot to learn.

Before the saw itself was delivered, I acquired a copy of the guidelines book, written by an obviously able radial arm saw user and teacher, Howard Silken. With Silken's help, I first tried to master the new saw even before it showed up in my workshop. After it came, I alternated between bouts in the basement and guidelines reading upstairs. Frankly, I am still in process. But in view of my previous use of such a saw, I had assumed that everything in the guidelines would be crystal clear, simply extending my present knowledge. I realized very quickly that that was not the actual situation.

Since a great part of my message today is about some reasonable clarity, let me first make sure that you know what a radial arm saw is. It is, basically, a very modern and impressive instrument for cutting and shaping wood in all kinds of sizes and angles and degrees. With special blades, it can be used on other materials like plastics, aluminum, and others. But it is fundamentally a shaper of pieces of wood.

As the name "radial arm" implies, the gimmicks on which the rotating saw blade is mounted do move back and forth in a kind of radius. But the whole instrument is arranged so that the mounting of the saw blade moves not only back and forth, but also at any possible angle. The saw blade may be arranged either horizontally or vertically, or at any angle in between. To be sure, all such cuts can be made with a hand saw or an electric rotary saw,

but never with a guarantee of precision. With the radial arm saw, if the measurements are correct and the saw is properly adjusted, even a tyro can turn out precise cuts. In short, this saw properly used can turn even a duffer, provided he is conscientious in his measurements and adjustments, into a master carpenter.

As I read Howard Silken's generally excellent guidelines for the radial arm saw, I first became more and more concerned about what a "fence" is and should be. I knew that, for cutting anything, you had to have something that it leaned against while the cutting was going on. Actually, that is what a fence is for, but it had not occurred to me that, for different kinds of cutting, different heights of fences would be helpful. Thus, once I had got the point, I went back to see if Howard Silken had told me what a fence is, and that having several fences of different heights and lengths would be useful; and I saw that he had not done so. As an expert, he had assumed that I would get this point in course. Well, he may be right. Finally, I did. But if he had said so earlier on, he could have saved me a lot of trouble.

Then I came to Howard Silken's treatment of joints, which are basic in all carpentry. His guidelines include drawings and photographs; so there is no question about his intention of giving genuine and specific advice provided the reader wants to accomplish something in particular. One of the Silken features throughout is the presentation of alternative ways of reaching a particular goal.

When I got to Joints, however, I was first thrown off by the mention of using a "dado." I was later able to dis-

cover that a "dado blade" is a saw blade that has been extended. Whereas the basic blade might have been set only to cut an eighth of an inch thick, the dado blade has things added so that it can cut a quarter of an inch, a half inch, or more. But Silken did not explain that fact. He assumed that I would know it.

It seems hardly necessary to belabor the point that Howard Silken's guidelines could be improved by better attention to what his radial arm saw users like me do and do not know already. His own competence with the saw prevents him from understanding the elementary facts that we, as tyros, do not know. At the same time, when he has identified something as a basic principle, he is likely to feed it to his reader endlessly and boringly. Thus, the question about Silken is whether he can identify basic principles, discuss them in consultative fashion with his readers, clarify the procedural steps, and thus inform the reader's actual experiments with the saw.

# I

My nascent thesis is that the minister is a guidelines writer not unlike Howard Silken and the radial arm saw. Whatever may have once been the case, the minister can no longer simply offer directions, instructions, or rules. As Silken does, the minister may mostly assume that the person involved wants to get certain results, and that his task is to say how to proceed. But even so, he cannot achieve this objective unless he is clear, explains what his hearer does not know but wants to know, and then explains in language that is understandable, with all new or technical terms clearly defined as he goes on.

If you don't already know what it means, a kerf may be as baffling as atonement. A tenon may be as tough as grace. Or a miter may be no more automatically clear than sin or providence. A half-lapped joint may be as obtuse as the old New England half-way covenant. Try a flat-ground dado in the same way you would test the presence of the Holy Spirit.

The minister is not, ordinarily, writing guidelines on how to use radial arm saws. But he is writing and speaking various kinds of guidelines. To be sure, that is not his whole work. His primary work is describing what the Word of God says to the human condition, helping people in whatever problems they have, leading the community in praise of God, and guiding his flock in both self-improvement and service of the larger community. But in all these leadership activities, he is in the guidelines business. He does not give orders. His suggestions are to be reflected and perhaps acted on, obedience is not a good word for the desired response. But that is only because the original meaning of obedience, in virtually all the Indo-European languages, as genuinely listening or hearing, was subverted into meaning "Mine not to reason why" but only to carry out orders.

Behind the basic guidelines idea for the minister stand not only Paul in Corinthians but also the leaders of the Reformation in their understanding of the ordained ministry. Calvin and Luther were realists about organizations including the church. They knew that somebody had to assume residual executive responsibility, and they worked to get that somebody educated so he could carry it out. They saw no contradiction between their belief that all



Christians were called, and that some were to exercise special responsibility. And I agree with them.

Mostly, the Reformers saw the proper exercise of the ordained minister's vocation in terms of his preaching and conducting worship, although they recognized some other functions like pastoral care. But they did understand, in terms of Christian vocation, that the ordained minister is to evoke and guide the vocations of other Christians. Perhaps they were a bit formal, even authoritarian, on how to go about that task in their day. Translated to our own time, however, there can be no question that the minister is a guidelines giver, whether he performs this task well or badly.

## II

Let me go back a bit. Guidelines refers to "how to." But guidelines are suggestions and not orders. They are relevant only to those who seek a procedure after accepting a common goal. Seldom in actual practice do they involve a single track. Usually there are more than one or two ways to move toward the goal. Guidelines suggest the possible ways of getting on toward the goal if the person or persons are already committed to reaching that goal.

Not all of the work of ministry is guidelines in the sense defined, but much of it is. And if this part is not effectively performed, the rest of it may be made difficult or impossible. Hence, writing, speaking, and communicating guidelines (not orders or rules or directions or instructions) comes close to being the heart of ministry.

In view of considerations of this kind, I regard preaching as primarily a descriptive activity, rather than a hortatory one. Guided by God's word, as we un-

derstand it, however fallibly, we the preachers try not so much to tell people what to do as to convey the underlying and existing realities revealed to us by the gospel's revelation. Thus there is always, as in guidelines, the big IF. IF you are concerned, then such and such follows. I would concede, of course, that all God-inspired preaching also tries to elicit the interest of those who hear the Word. But hortatory declarations very seldom accomplish this feat.

Pastoral care is in a similar position. Whatever the problems that people share with us, we try first to help them in the terms on which they are prepared to receive help. Later on, they may indeed be ready to consider more seriously the message of the gospel; and at that point we should be ready. But any preoccupation with getting them initially to accept our frame of reference, apart from their own situation, is bound to fail. Guidelines may be important, but the right to offer them must be won. It cannot be assumed.

I could go through the several other functions of ministry, and believe I could make the same kind of point. Education, administration, evangelism, and others—all require ministerial guidelines but not rules, instructions, orders, or directions. Christian laymen are collaborators, not serfs. The kind of help they need is represented in guidelines. At times the guidelines may be very sharp and honest. But they are never hortatory, as if there were a discrepancy between the goals of the minister and those of the layman. On the "how" question there may be all kinds of critiques. But it is the Word and the Holy Spirit who enable our laymen to be committed, precisely as they do with us. Hence, we ought not to insult our

laymen by presuming a basic difference. If we find a difference in actual practice, of course, we can take it into account in our work.

### III

In conclusion, precisely how does the guidelines metaphor of the ministry get us ahead? I believe it does so in several ways:

1. It compels us to confront the "how to" question. Although this is not the whole question of ministerial responsibility, it is basic, and often neglected. We take the "how to" out of the gimmick class, and confront it with basic principles; and, however fallibly, try to give clear guidance about what is possible, even including several routes to the goal.

2. It gives us help in getting away from one-way instructions, directions, rules, and codes. Thus, it pushes us to take our people as co-Christians and collaborators on a proper basis. If we accept the responsibility for saying how to do something, even with a lot of maybes attached, we are off our perfectionistic high horses because we know how difficult the "how to" can be in actual living. We need to share this feeling and conviction and experience with our people, not hide it.

3. It makes unmistakably clear that we have a special responsibility—not to tell people what to do—but to delineate ways in which they can live the Christian life. It is not a substitute for their conviction that they have Christian faith and want to live a Christian life. But once that is given, then they need guidelines. And we are the people who must come through. Not with a law, but with guidelines in the sense defined above.

Finally, let me go back to Paul. "For though you have countless guides in Christ, you do not have many fathers" (I Cor. 4:15). In this allegedly democratic age, by no means all grown-up adult males want to be fathers in Paul's sense. They may be willing to be parents. But fatherhood in a broader sense may be interpreted as authoritarian, undesirable, controlling, and hence to be rejected. I see no reason for assigning these pejorative adjectives inherently to fatherhood in the metaphorical sense. It is of utmost importance that we have good fathers in church and society, both in the literal and the metaphorical senses. If we really have something, as Paul rightly believed he had, then why disguise it? Why not declare and practice our fatherhood? Through guidelines, to be sure, not rules or orders. But come clean on it nevertheless.

In every Christian church, new ministers are questioning their work and their vocation. At Princeton I may perhaps be fortunate in getting, in the senior year, so many of the students who are clearly committed. If I did not have a few such students, I suppose I would go back to a new level of questioning myself. But I have them and they are genuine. I also know that a lot of others, not so clear now, will eventually be equally committed to the ministry. So there is no sheep and goats situation. To the extent that I am able to communicate the guidelines notion to our students, I think that it makes them freer to accept and be committed to the ministry, or to go elsewhere without guilt. Either way, I regard this release as desirable. Ministers can stand all kinds of external pressures. But if they are not basically integrated within, then there is trouble.

Paul made a big thing of his fatherhood. I guess I am just old enough to make some kind of point about my own fatherhood. But, since fathers and sons are having a devil of a time these days, that may not be worth much. But my injunction to young ministers is: know that your job involves guidelines, and that, on many occasions, no matter

what your ignorance, you have to be a father. To use Paul's term, don't think you can be so "arrogant" as to get around that obligation. "For the kingdom of God does not consist in talk but in power." (I Cor. 4:20). I say to you, accept the power, and use it through proper guidelines, whether expressed in sermons, pastoral care, or in other ways.

# The Only Sin

by FREDERICK E. SONTAG

ALL the fuss and discussion over what sin is and how many kinds there are is so much wasted energy, unless you enjoy endless arguments. Basically, there is only one sin, although men are ingenious in committing it always in new ways. "To sin" means to disobey God, and in each new day it is hard to discern God's specific will, or at least we are not sure how to evaluate new circumstances. However, for the Christian, one commandment expresses God's will and no others are necessary: To love our neighbor as ourself, which was extended by Jesus to include even our enemies.

Thus, man's basic sin is to fail to love others and to express that love in kind acts, but what we overlook sometimes is that the root of sin lies in whatever blocks affection or holds back our acts of mercy. In every case, this block is caused by self-concern, so that "the only sin" is to be occupied with our own concerns and to be unable to gain release from them. The self is the source of sin, because it is natural for the ego to stand on the horizon and thus to block every other concern from view. It channels all requests for aid first through its own concerns by natural instinct. The self is

*Professor of Philosophy at Pomona College, Claremont, California, since 1952, Frederick E. Sontag is an alumnus of Stanford University (A.B., 1949) and Yale University (Ph.D., 1952). He has been visiting professor at Union Theological Seminary, New York, at Collegio di Sant' Anselmo in Rome, and at the University of Copenhagen. He has published many articles in scholarly and professional journals and is the author of ten books, including How Philosophy Shapes Theology (Harper & Row, 1971). This article was written in the summer of 1972 during a stay at St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota.*

prone to sin because, if it is not to sin constantly, it must escape the inborn drive to its own self-preservation as its first allegiance.

To sin, then, is as natural as to breathe, because we automatically consider our own needs first. This is really what "original sin" means, that by birth we are drawn to defend ourselves and to feed our personal wants first, while what "God's will" is goes against nature because it demands that we deny precisely what comes naturally to us—ourselves. No man can, without severe suffering and training, learn to deny himself and consider others first, but we face an unnatural God and that is what he demands.

Even our native religious instincts are poor guides and must be unlearned. For what brings most men to religion first is the wrong reason, a sickness in themselves, a desire for their own healing, a need in us to be secure in relation to God. On the other hand, what God's will demands is the reversal of the very religious instinct which draws men to him in the first place. No wonder God is so little understood and churches so often are places of such intense self-concern. His will cannot be found until



"the only sin" of self-absorption is discovered, and then both churches and individuals must be turned inside out and the ways of nature reversed.

## I

Did Adam sin and do all men sin with Adam's fall? Is sin inherited with the race? Yes, Adam thought of his own wants and his personal needs at the time he ate. His own comforts and desires were first in his mind, and this blinded him to the consideration of others and the consequences involved in his actions. We all, as men, inherited an inability to put ourselves aside, that is, unless we first go through much trial and testing and training. Thus, in the most real sense possible, we all inherit Adam's sin.

Augustine said that all men were divided according to the direction of their affection, and so they are, except that he thought the division lay between those who loved God versus men, or those who loved the eternal versus the mutable. That is one way to divide men, but it is neither the most important nor the division of sin. We are divided according to whether our affections are attached primarily to ourselves, our desires and bodily interests, or whether others can be considered first, either God or men. This split does not divide men evenly. Millions yearn, knowingly or unknowingly, to be free from their self's demands, but few actually achieve such self-release, that is to say, are freed from the bondage of sin.

In a day in which we almost make a hero out of the homosexual and struggle to present debauchery more vividly on the screen and on the streets, we ask: Is homosexuality a sin; is the seeking of violent pleasure (e.g., with drugs)

as such, a sin? It is a sin if the homosexual seeks only his own pleasure without considering the effect on others. Like any strong sex drive, it tends to blind its possessor to anything but his own need, in which case it moves naturally to sin by using others as instruments for its own pleasure. Strong or violent pleasures are equally blind to all but their own thrills, and in that sense they work not to allow us to any consideration outside ourselves.

Is murder a sin; is war a sin? In the majority of cases, yes, because what prompts aggressive violence is either the attempt to satisfy our physical or psychological needs, or to protect ourselves by blotting out whatever threatens us. Is paranoia a sin? In its medical extremes, no, because the person is beyond rational control and is sick with the sin of self-obsession. In its mild and pervasive form, the fear that everyone is against us, is the epitome of sin, because we are always bending the whole world and the actions of everyone around us toward our concerns. What we need most is to be freed from all self-concern and to worry about someone else.

## II

Did Martin Luther sin? He certainly seemed to think so, particularly prior to his conversion experience. Yet, like most men who are religiously disposed, he sinned most by being obsessed with his own actions and his own fate. Had he forgotten this and lost himself in the concerns of others, he might still have sinned mildly but he would not have been obsessed by it. Luther sinned by being a monk, in the sense that most people do who are caught up in a religious life.

What drives such people to the mon-

astery or the church is self-obsession, and what they need most to be freed from is not their actions, often petty in themselves, but from their constant preoccupation with themselves. They are right in turning to religion but wrong in continuing to press their self-concern, and they will not be cured until they are removed from their own presence, whether it is a man or God who does this. To be forgiven, then, is not really to say that your penalty has been paid or your sentence removed, but rather to be able to say that you have been released from the bond of your own concern.

Did Jesus sin; does God ever sin? Jesus certainly came close to it at times, for instance when he prayed to have his fated task removed from him. However, theologians are probably right in saying that Jesus did remain free from sin, because he thought of himself and his own desire, but he never, in fact, yielded his *actions* up to follow his self's wish. Kazantzakis catches this distinction perfectly in his *Last Temptation of Christ*. Jesus was tempted. He did dream at times of his own comfort, but he put Satan (himself) behind him and allowed his action to be determined by the needs of others, not his own.

Did God sin in creating a world with more harsh and unfavorable conditions than he needed to set for men? It sometimes appears that he had his own needs and pleasure more in mind in creating the world and in choosing its plan, than what would be best for man, and many Gods are pictured as acting from their own motives. Christians, however, claim to have a "revelation" of God primarily because they think he will prove himself finally to be free of this

personal sin. He has declared our needs to be ahead of his.

Do Americans sin in pursuing a war in Vietnam? The argument over this is real, precisely because the question is whether all or any part of the military action is a self-sacrifice, that is, an attempt to consider the needs of others ahead of our own real loss of life and money. Those who see it as a sin attribute selfish motives even to the expenditure of lives and material wealth in pursuing a war, and they are convinced that, at least after a certain point, selfish motives keep us involved rather than any concern for the future well-being of the country's citizens.

To the degree that the war springs from selfishness, it is a sin. To the extent that it can be thought to be a help to others, a justification can be attempted. But this assessment is difficult because no neat separation can be made along pure lines, which is why the Vietnam war has made Americans so conscious of sin once more. That is, we see that no motives are pure and unselfish, and that self-concern has a tendency to take over, especially when the situation becomes difficult. No action is free of sin, because public actions in particular always become partially self and ego involved. Once in, this will crowd out every other concern if it is given a chance.

It is also hard to determine for someone else what really helps him, and so the war exposes a sad fact that as men we are doubly caught. First, we are caught in the web of our own self-interest, and then, even when we free ourselves from that temporarily for a generous act, we have trouble knowing what really meets the need of another man. In our ignorance we are likely to

offer him what would satisfy our needs rather than his.

To escape sin we have to set our self-demands aside, but then we are appalled to find that we have to "become the other qua other" if we are to have any idea of what he needs and to escape imposing our self-interest ironically just at the moment we thought we had escaped it by a self-sacrificing act. How can we learn to set ourselves aside and become identical with the internal distress of another? This is a divine act, or at least Christians tell us that it is what God has learned to do.

### III

Is it a sin to pursue reform in the church and in ecclesiastical structure, or is it an act of the highest religious purity? To the extent that protest springs from self-righteousness, reform seems to involve us in sin, because we end by asserting the primacy of our own ways. If religious institutions and leaders need constantly to be pressed for reform, because religious ways and rituals have a peculiar tendency to drift into self-satisfaction, then reform is a constant religious obligation. The "narrow road" and the "razor's edge" seem to lie in assessing the motives for the reform movement.

Are you being inconvenienced and hampered, put down and not allowed your way? Then, even if the suggestion has merits in itself, its promoter is involved in sin. If the prophet of reform genuinely speaks out because others are being hurt or needs are not being met which either changed ways or personal action or new words would help, then the reform is religiously pure. It depends not so much on the suggestion

as on the motive for the outcry and rebellion. That is difficult to assess, even by the reformer, and that is partly why religious reform is so hard to deal with.

"God alone looks on the heart," we are told, and untangling that maze of human motives and self-attachments must be the hardest task divinity knows. By comparison, creating a world is simple. Were sin more overt and connected more clearly with certain actions, and if virtue's way more firmly fixed on particular behavior, the history of the human race would certainly be different and the drive to religion less intense. Sin has been hidden at the center of human action, and the desire to be free of this self-involvement is, ironically, self-defeating to the religiously driven man. That is, it remains so until he learns that even his self-concern over sin is itself the source of sin and the principle trap God has set for man.

God, we are told, has himself escaped this pitfall of necessary self-concern by emptying himself, by taking on himself the form of the servant. And the servant is perhaps the only one who can discover what those whom he waits upon really need. Even man's religious drive which comes in response to that divine solution, is still caught in the same trap. God alternately laughs and cries until men see that it is their own self-concern which still blocks them and makes religion itself all too much like another self-seeking warfare. If we fall low enough to realize this, then perhaps pure religious cry escapes or is forced from us: "God, help! Save us from ourselves. First, make us back into nothing and then we shall be free"—from self-obsession and from the only sin.

# Tears and Elie Wiesel

by JOHN K. ROTH

*A member of the Department of Philosophy at Claremont Men's College, Claremont, California, John K. Roth is a graduate of Pomona College (B.A., 1962) and Yale University (Ph.D., 1966), with further studies as Graves Fellow at Harvard University. The author of seven books, including The Philosophy of Josiah Royce (Crowell, 1971), Dr. Roth has published many articles in various journals and is making a critical study of the writings of Elie Wiesel.*

LATELY something has been puzzling me. I do not regard myself as an emotional person, so why do I sometimes find myself about to weep? Nobody notices, but why is it that especially in church on Sunday mornings tears well up in my eyes?

People go to church for many reasons. One of mine is to experience tears. Fortunately, we are moving out of an arid period when it was not considered quite appropriate or rational to speak openly about religious experience. Emotion is also regaining its rightful place in spiritual life. I sense that my tears are an emotional expression with religious significance. Still, as has always been true in religion, the task of interpreting one's emotions is difficult indeed.

The tune of a familiar hymn, a passage of scripture, a flash of memory evoked by a sermon—any of these can move me toward tears. It has taken a long time, however, to clarify what this means. Now an interpretation is taking shape. Interestingly, I find that it has come not so much in the experience of worship itself but through an encounter with the writings of a Jew, Elie Wiesel. The following thoughts are written partly to thank him. They are also set down to help me understand what he taught me and with the hope that by sharing my experience other persons

may be aided in their spiritual searching.

At the outset it is important to know three things about me. First, some basic facts: I am a young teacher of philosophy; my family and I are active in the Claremont (California) Presbyterian Church; and my life has been rich and good. Hardship and suffering have rarely touched me directly. The amount of tragedy in my personal life gives no reason for tears. Quite to the contrary, I have every reason to rejoice and to celebrate life.

Second, although most Christian worship—especially in its contemporary garb—emphasizes joy and celebration, I find it difficult to identify with these themes in any simple way. Certainly there can be tears of joy, and my tears are joyful in a sense. But they contain many other feelings too, some far removed from celebration. My task is to understand how all of these feelings fit together, and why they emerge particularly in a setting of Christian worship.

I have already alluded to the third point: a friend's suggestion led me to Elie Wiesel's writings. Wiesel's family was included in the millions of Jews slaughtered by the Nazis. Amazingly, he lived through Auschwitz and Buchenwald as a teenager, surviving to become a witness for the dead. All of his writings are influenced profoundly



by these experiences.<sup>1</sup> They also incorporate a wealth of Jewish spirituality. Wiesel's writing is part of his own ongoing quest for self-understanding, and perhaps this is why it can be so useful to others. His work stands among the most penetrating and provocative philosophical and religious writing that I know. Any person—and Christians in a special way—can have a deeply moving experience by reading his books.

Wiesel portrays the suffering and the endurance of the Jews. Undergirding this effort is an attempt to understand how God relates to man and what God might be like, if he exists at all. Wiesel finds no final answers that can be put into words. He implies that the richest and most lasting insights may come in a

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of Wiesel's most recent book, *Souls on Fire*, his works are available in inexpensive paperback editions. The titles are listed here with the paperback publishers, but with original copyright dates which may help readers interested in the chronological development of Wiesel's writings.

The books fall into two major groups. One consists of novels which incorporate themes drawn out of the Nazi death camp experiences and the Jewish effort to secure and hold Israel after World War II. Works in this category are: *Dawn* (Avon Books: New York, 1960), *The Accident* (Avon Books: New York, 1961), *The Gates of the Forest* (Avon Books: New York, 1964), *The Town Beyond the Wall* (Avon Books: New York, 1964), and *A Beggar in Jerusalem* (Avon Books: New York, 1970).

The second group contains essays and autobiographical writings as well as vignettes and tales drawn out of the Jewish religious tradition. Works in this category are: *Night* (Avon Books: New York, 1958), *The Jews of Silence* (Signet Books: New York, New American Library, 1966), *Legends of Our Time* (Avon Books: New York, 1968), *One Generation After* (Avon Books: New York, 1970), and *Souls on Fire* (Random House: New York, 1972).

mystical silence which transcends the limits of speech and writing. Yet, the dialogue of his characters, the descriptions and images he provides, the Jewish tales that he tells—all of these are so powerful as to set the reader off on a spiritual odyssey.

## I

. There are two special reasons why Wiesel's books captivate me. First, he focuses continually on themes concerning suffering and evil. He knows that no contemporary Jew—indeed no living person—can begin to fathom one's relation to God without passing through the world's death camps. He suggests to Christians that any simple or easy view of God's love is phony. If we are to understand God as love, this image must be tempered by the fact that fires of hell blaze on earth. It struck me as I read Wiesel that the faith of many Christians—myself included—is often shallow because we fail to bring the world's terror face to face with our claims about God's goodness. The Jewish spiritual life that Wiesel describes may set a more honest example for us.

The other thing that impressed me was this: Wiesel's picture of Jewish religious expression combines an awesome sense of God's transcendence and sovereignty with a very forthright and emotional human reaction toward God. These Jews are both genuinely humble and boldly honest before God. They recognize that their lives are given and shaped by a power far greater than man himself, but also by one who seems often to hold himself completely aloof from man's cries. They sense that they deal with a God who has set conditions for life that are tender and good in many ways but that are also harsh, de-

manding, and brutal beyond understanding. Their God is no simple loving father. He seems at times to act without reason, even to be consumed by madness. This concept of God fits many of the facts of our lives very well.

Wiesel's Jews suffer and die, live, endure, and hope in a context of ambiguity set by God. This context involves a covenant of life between God and the Jews, but also the ovens of Auschwitz. It demands obedience to the Torah by a God who seems at times to hold himself above every law and justice itself. It promises a saving messiah, but his coming is always in the future. The Jew seeks to understand. Sometimes his frustration is too much to bear. His virtue, however, is that he also expresses this to God. In doing so, and in the silence that follows, some men reject or lose God. Others achieve a deepened understanding of him and man's condition.

## II

Tears play an important part in the spiritual expressions that concern Wiesel. Through his descriptions of the meaning of tears, I found light breaking in on my own experience. Like the Jew's understanding of God, Wiesel suggests that tears are never simple. They pour out a mixture of feeling too rich and complex for words alone. Still, the tears that Wiesel pictures contain certain elements that can be discerned.

Tears come out of many situations and at any age. Wiesel, however, concentrates on the most profound kind—those shed as the result of deep suffering and loss. Such tears involve a collage of emotion. They may be partly for oneself, welling up in response to the gaping emptiness produced by natural dis-

asters, cruelty, hatred, violence, war, and death. In this dimension, Wiesel believes, tears may at times contain an element of guilt over the awareness that one's own life has been spared while others have not. We know that we could—or perhaps should—have been in the place where tragedy fell. Yet we were not. The puzzling, arbitrary contingency of life leaves us wondering—perhaps with a sense of guilt—why we survived or were left untouched.

The same tears that fall for ourselves can be shed for others, for those who have been hurt or lost. The awareness and memory of futures that might have been are too much for words. They break the heart in sobs. Such tears recognize—indeed they celebrate—the goodness of life, but the waste in existence also brings an irrepressible shudder.

Wiesel also writes about tears directed toward God. They encompass anger, frustration, and protest against life's injustice and irrationality. They reveal man's recognition of his own limits. But this recognition of weakness also has its strength. Tears of helplessness before God may at the same time be expressions of acceptance, determination to endure, and tenacity in holding God to his promises to bless and care for human life. If tears can embrace such promises, they can become tears of joy. On the other hand, no tears directed toward God in joy can be very profound unless they have first been sowed in grief, protest, and despair.

These are some of the things that Elie Wiesel teaches me. He helps me to know why I may cry in worship and why tears are not out of place in Christian celebration. Indeed, he shows that they are a vital part of honest religious

faith. Wiesel sees human life as a complex web of relations. They tie men together in sometimes startling ways. All living persons are survivors of someone's tragedy. Every life is the legacy of another's pain and suffering. Good and evil feed on each other. Auschwitz has a special place in Jewish memory, but it is a part—at least symbolically—of every man's history now. Wiesel sees his task as that of a witness. What occurred in the death camps must not be forgotten. Religiously speaking, his point is this: If a man is to achieve an understanding of God, a positive hope in God's goodness and love that is free of shallowness, he can obtain it only through a veil of tears. That is why tears, worship, and religious celebration go together.

Wiesel's writings make at least two more important points about tears. Then he leaves me with a haunting question. One point is that tears have their proper time and place. Sometimes Wiesel's characters refuse to cry; they even reproach those who do. Human dignity, man's duty to defy and his moral rebellion against the worst of horror-filled situations may demand the holding back of tears. Instead of weeping, authentic humanity may require expressions of joy from us—songs and laughter in utter darkness. Tears cannot always be held back, but unless they are ultimately a means for affirming life, they are unworthy. That, I think, is Wiesel's point. Tears should never be an end in themselves.

On the other hand, Wiesel sometimes portrays men who are unable to cry. Life has been too brutal. Suffering and loss have been so extreme that tears have run dry and are no longer possible. For these persons, grace some-

times comes in cathartic moments when feeling breaks free anew in sobs. This flowing of emotion is one mark of full humanity for Wiesel. When restored after being lost, it begins a process of healing. Wiesel suggests, however, that the healing will never remove every scar so long as memory endures. What has been lost or destroyed can never be completely recovered. The past cannot be taken back and lived differently. Thus, no transformation of life by God or man—short of one that blots out memory absolutely—is likely to eliminate the possibility of tears. Even in the Kingdom of God, they may flow from time to time.

Here is the question that Wiesel leaves me: Does God weep, and what difference does it make to us? Two preliminary comments are important. First, the question is vast. It can be introduced here only to provoke thought not to satisfy it. Second, it is, of course, a very "anthropological" question to ask about God. For some—especially for all those who pride themselves on being "rigorous" thinkers—this question will be a scandal. Wiesel's writings, however, convince me that direct, even anthropological talk about God can communicate very powerfully. We make a mistake if we try to satisfy the spirit with language tailored only to the usual norms of philosophical validity and scientific objectivity.

### III

Wiesel draws extensively on religious stories and tales in the Jewish tradition. It is understood that these are not literal accounts about God. It is recognized that the most genuine apprehension of God can be found in a silence that words merely help to produce. But the

stories and the talk about God are direct, concrete, full of life. The God in Wiesel's books is beyond systematic comprehension. Yet he is one to whom men speak. They argue with him, protest against him, and perhaps even love him—all quite personally and passionately.

The theologian and preacher can learn from Wiesel. Theologies and sermons that speak directly about God, that are immediate and vivid and yet capable of leading us toward apprehension of God in silence, are perhaps what we need to enrich religious life today. Certainly any religious revival occurring now has not been the result of recent theological scholarship and preaching that have refused to speak directly about what God might be like. Wiesel's writings have much to teach Christian leaders about how to speak of God.

Back to the question itself. It can spin off various lines of thought, but for now I find myself considering the following. If God is absolutely incapable of tears, the proper evaluation of human life may well be that it is largely a tragic absurdity from start to finish. A God with no capacity for tears can probably feel nothing. Unless God can feel in some sense, it is difficult to apprehend him as good and loving. If he cannot cry, it is difficult to believe that our tragedy and death transcend meaninglessness because he is our beginning and our destiny. We should hope, then, that God can weep.

This thought leads to another question: What is the meaning of a capacity for tears in God? It could mean that God is finite and impotent, too limited to overcome the destructiveness set loose by his own creation. Such a God might be in tears perpetually, but still be un-

able to save either us or himself. This God would be no better religiously than one incapable of tears altogether.

We need a God capable of tears but also with power sufficient to overcome and transform the things that might lead him to weep. Men will naturally hope that these factors include human suffering and every form of needless pain and destruction. But if this hope is followed to the end, we may conclude that the realities that could make God weep are more complex than first imagined.

#### IV

Both the Jewish and the Christian traditions emphasize not only man's freedom but God's as well. His choice to create this world rather than some other was not necessitated. The structure of existence—and of human life in particular—could have been set differently by God. The degree of evil and suffering it involves might have been less, probably without seriously compromising the possibilities for goodness. This suggests that the conditions that could lead God to weep may be partly internal to himself. God may anguish over his own choices, which are made in freedom with other options always open. Moreover, even though God could envision fully the possibility of the suffering and destruction that the world exhibits, and even though he may have consciously chosen a world which made it probable that many of these options would occur, it may still be that their accumulated actualization is a shock to God himself. Perhaps it is even less easy to be God than to be a man.

If evil and suffering could be a shock to God, there are several responses that



he could make. Consider some involving tears. We might be living in a time when God weeps, but when he is overcome by tears, immobilized with respect to changing the conditions that cause him to cry. If so, this is a time of waiting for man. But it is also a time to act with dignity and compassion. It is a time to pray too. By doing both, men could help God and the world through their pain.

Or we might be in a time when the shock immobilizes God even with respect to tears themselves. Like some of Wiesel's characters, the horror of actual existence might take God beyond tears. In this case, too, we both wait and need to act. We must hope that God himself can experience a catharsis of feeling and bring healing action to himself and us. But perhaps our own acts of compassion and faithfulness are required to develop this process.

Or we might be in an age when God would like to weep but elects not to do so. He waits himself to see what will happen next. He hopes that men will rise to heights yet unachieved, thus helping to vindicate and redeem his original decisions in creation. This God cares, but he also has a streak of toughness and self-control. He knows that the world is a wild scene, that the triumphs of love and justice are costly and rare. He knows that life tests men hard and frequently breaks them. He understands that everything could have been different, and he accepts the responsibility that is his. The havoc created by his choices and their results touches his tender side, leaving him constantly on the verge of tears. Still, he holds them back, keeping his eyes clear to see the human spirit soar once more.

My own experience, faith, and hope

incline me toward this last image, but something more needs to be added to it to avoid the conclusion that we are primarily the victims of divinely cruel play. Views about this addition are perhaps the fork where Elie Wiesel and I take different roads. They constitute the line that differentiates Jewish and Christian brothers.

God's waiting, his withholding of healing tears, begins to be more bearable—although it often remains hard to accept—if God has provided a genuine sign of his promise to alter the conditions of existence in the future so that destruction and death are overcome. This transformation may not totally eliminate the possibility of tears and some forms of suffering because memory may remain. But the change would restore and recreate our lives, restricting destruction and death to the realm of memory so that suffering and tears are minimized if present at all.

A Christian finds the sign of such a promise embodied in Jesus. Both the Jew and the Christian are waiting people; both live by a faith that holds God to promises about the future. Promises—especially God's—are not always easy to live with. The Christian, however, differs from the Jew in believing that Jesus is the unique and truest sign of God's ultimate intentions toward us. The Jew does not share this faith, and his waiting is probably harder. Jesus makes the Christian's life easy and difficult simultaneously—easy because of the assurance that the Christian may experience, but difficult because Jesus himself is a puzzle and one who places urgent demands for compassion and service on his followers in this world. Still, as it usually has been, the Jew's lot seems more difficult. He lives and

waits with a promise—with demands too—but without the sign accepted by the Christian.

Now I understand better that sometimes my tears in church are out of wonder and thanks for Jesus. I want very much to believe that man's existence is not a futile sputter of feeling, hope, and love in a cruelly destructive

void. Hope is always risky, but mine is oriented toward and encouraged by Jesus. After reading Elie Wiesel my faith may be less sure of itself, because no one can read his books without being shaken. On the other hand, I think my faith is also more passionate than before. I am grateful to him for moving me, for setting my soul on fire.

# No Faith No Church

Sermon by  
ERNEST T. CAMPBELL

*The preaching minister of the Riverside Church in New York City, Ernest T. Campbell, is third in a distinguished succession in one of America's most strategic pulpits; his two predecessors were Harry E. Fosdick and Robert J. McCracken. An alumnus of Princeton Theological Seminary (B.D. '48; Th.M. '53), Dr. Campbell served pastorates in Pennsylvania and Michigan before coming to New York in 1968. He is the author of A Christian Manifesto (Harper & Row, 1970) and is visiting lecturer in Homiletics at Princeton. Sermon preached on September 24, 1972, in New York.*

*"Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." Mark 9:24.*

A MAN made his way to the Southwest corner of 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue to visit the central building of the New York Public Library. He passed the sculptured lions that keep their vigil at the gates, climbed the marble stairs that would do a palace justice, walked between those two towering renaissance pillars and through the doors. He was ill-prepared for what he saw inside: Glass covered display cases, mounted stamp collections hanging from the walls, busts of notable benefactors, a store, rest-rooms, check-rooms, telephones, stairs and elevators. Finally, in a dark mood of rising desperation, he turned to a member of the staff and cried, "Where do they keep the books?"

To many outsiders, and not a few insiders, The Riverside Church must seem like a bewildering assortment of unrelated projects, causes and activities. What one is likely to see when she comes to The Riverside Church depends on the day and hour and the door through which she enters.

People can be forgiven for coming into this place, seeing its theatre and

tower, its gymnasium and cafeteria, its parking facilities and radio station, its many halls and elevators and asking, "Where do they keep the faith?"

What books are to a library, faith is to a church. No books, no library! No faith, no church! Because it is expected that the first sermon of the new season will have a key-note quality about it, I have deliberately set aside a host of other options and chosen to speak to you today of faith.

\* \* \*

The scriptures say some tall things about faith. "Without faith it is impossible to please God." (Heb. 11:6) "All things are possible to him who believes." (Mark 9:23) And perhaps most astoundingly of all, that sweeping word of St. Paul's, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Romans 14:23) We are told in the Bible that faith can move mountains. It can set a man straight with God. It can generate enormous reserves of hope and love.

How shall we define this elusive desirable, this critical quality called faith? The writer of Hebrews defined it as,

"The assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen." (Heb. 11:1) John Calvin defined it as "a steady and certain knowledge of the divine benevolence towards us, which being founded on the truth of the gratuitous promise in Christ is both revealed to our minds and confirmed to our hearts by the Holy Spirit." Gerhard Ebeling, a contemporary German theologian, says simply, "Faith is man's participation in God."

Defined in these or similar ways, it is no exaggeration to say that without faith, whatever else a church may have, it is nothing. Yes, without faith it is impossible *even for a church* to please God.

\* \* \*

Let me move on now to make and amplify three statements about faith. Faith is always mixed with doubt. Faith is always tied to life. Faith's chief resource is Jesus.

Faith is always mixed with doubt. Faith and doubt are nourished by the same inner energies. They are, as it were, two sides of the same coin. Only the man who doubts can believe and only the man who believes can doubt. The scripture read today bears this out. (Mark 9:14-29) Jesus and the "A" team, Peter, James and John, had gone up into the mountain of Transfiguration in the north country near Caesarea Philippi. Meanwhile, the "B" team, the remaining nine, on the flats below were approached by a man who wanted healing for his epileptic son. The truth of the matter is that neither team fared well. As Hillyer Straton has put it, "One group of disciples did not know what to do on the mount, and the others were powerless to help in the valley."

Presently, Jesus came down from the mountain with the three disciples and confronted the distraught father. The lad's condition was pitiable indeed. He had all the symptoms of genuine epilepsy; spasms, foaming at the mouth, grinding of the teeth, and motionless stupors. As Jesus faced the anxious father, a soul-stirring dialogue ensued. Jesus asked the father, "How long has he had this?" The father replied, "From childhood . . . but if you can do anything, have pity and help us." Jesus responded with some vehemence, "If you *can*?" A leper, you will remember, had said to Jesus, "Lord, if you *will*, you can make me clean." (Mark 1:40) Here, "if you can," is the best the father can do. Jesus answered, "If you can? All things are possible to him who believes." Immediately the father came back with one of the most honest confessions to be found anywhere in literature; "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief."

There is the mix: "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief." We have here not one man saying, "Lord, I believe," and another saying, "Help Thou mine unbelief," but one and the same man saying both. Faith and doubt are inseparable. Wherever you find the one you are bound to find the other.

\* \* \*

The second statement: Faith is always tied to life. History is the sphere in which faith operates. The habitat of faith is time and place. It is only as life interrogates us that we know *what* we believe and *how deeply* we believe it. Indeed, it is only as life interrogates us that we discover the need to believe.

It is not the case, then, that we get our faith all worked out intellectually—per-



haps in college, perhaps in a seminary, perhaps in our own homes—and then go out to apply what we have put together in life situations.

The structure of St. Paul's epistles is misleading at this point. The apostle first formulated his convictions and then connected them to life. This was the way Paul *expressed* his faith, but this was not the way the apostle *got* his faith! He got it as he went. To put it aphoristically, "You know as you go."

I had an interesting conversation with a young man this summer around the shore of Lake Junaluska in North Carolina. He is a choice young man who has finished three years of college. His father is one of the abler preachers in the South. He comes from a solid home where he is much loved and well supported. He is flirting with the ministry but going through what he described as a mild crisis of faith. As we walked together, he confessed to this void in his life. "I'm not sure that I have faith. I'm not sure that I believe."

Suddenly it occurred to me to ask this attractive young man one question. Speaking in love and out of genuine concern I said: "What would you do with more faith now if you had it?" I went on to suggest that he really had few needs at present that required faith. His father and mother are financing his college life. He has a faculty that cares about him. He has a home to go back to. All things are being provided for him. "What would you do with more faith now if you had it? What do you need more faith for anyway?"

If I understand the Bible correctly, there is an economy with God regarding the gift of faith. It is only as we attempt great things for God that we can expect great things from God. If we

are content to play the "money game" or the "status game" or the "pleasure game," we don't need faith for that! If we are only playing "nine to five 'till 65 and then away," we don't need faith for that! But if we are trying to move some mountain of unbelief, apathy, prejudice, injustice, or hatred, it is then that God will give us faith. We know as we go. If we will not go we will not know.

A friend of mine was giving a series of lectures at an institution many miles from here. This man is known as much for his honesty as for his erudition and eloquence. It was his candor that prompted him to end his last lecture something like this, "I'd have more to say to you on this subject if I were clearer on the resurrection. But right now, frankly, I don't believe it." Later a colleague on the host faculty reprimanded him: "You shouldn't have said that. Where did you ever get the idea that you had to believe everything all the time?" He went on, "When you have to believe in the resurrection, you will." My friend said, "When will I believe it?" His host replied, "When you die, or when you die with someone else."

Job did not know how deeply he believed until his wife advised him to curse God and die. Under the provocation of that option, he found it in his soul to say, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust him." (Job 13:15) Faith is tied to life.

\* \* \*

Finally, this word: Faith's chief resource is Jesus. To talk of faith in Christian circles is to talk of Jesus. We commonly think of Jesus as an *object* of our faith. And he is that, indeed. But he is also for us the *source* of faith.

We believe *in* him but we also believe *through* him and *like* him.

The question that ministers face as they contemplate the paucity of faith in themselves and in their congregation, is, "How is faith generated?" Only too well we know how unbelief and pessimism are generated. But what is it that generates faith? The answer, I believe, is that Jesus is the primary source of faith.

May I remind you that the predominant characteristic of Jesus was his consciousness of God. Virtually all of the critics are agreed on this. From first to last, in shine and shadow, Jesus was conscious of God.

Form critics have worked the gospels over time and time again. These scholars are generally agreed that at least three aspects of the gospel tradition are traceable directly to Jesus. What are these? They are the parables, the teachings about the Kingdom of God, and the Lord's Prayer. The outstanding characteristic of the parables, the teaching on the Kingdom of God, and the Lord's Prayer is Jesus' assumption that God is real and active.

As we draw near to Jesus we find that his basic trust in God is contagious. When we hang around some people we find ourselves drifting into dirty speech. When we hang around some other people, we find ourselves laughing more. When we hang around still other people, we tend to become cynical. *But when we begin to keep company with Jesus we start to believe.*

Jesus brings us to faith. He is faith's most reliable witness and most convincing spokesman. His life awakens faith. He inspires us to doubt our doubts and believe our beliefs. He provokes the

questions that induce and evoke faith.

Faith, then, does not come by exhortation. It come through exposure to Jesus who is the source of faith. This is why it is important for us to read the scriptures and avail ourselves of the sacraments, to sense His presence in other people, and to be open to His spirit in the world around us.

\* \* \*

We are familiar with the term "identity crisis." Teenagers rebel, we are told, in part because they want to know who they are. Black separatism is a strategy by which America's largest minority may come to know itself in terms other than those imposed by a white majority. A woman who gives up a career in order to marry and have a home will begin to ask herself again, "Who am I?"

The church is caught in an identity crisis today. Who are we anyway, we whose work in so many ways and places is duplicated by others? Why are we here?

I am proposing in this key-note message that we are in essence those who believe in God through Jesus Christ. At bottom, we are what Paul called us in a remarkably felicitous phrase, "the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10). *It is our faith that constitutes us as Christian.* The richness of Riverside is its people. The richness of its people is their faith.

It is my judgment that we cannot do much for others, or for long, until we know who we are. The activist is right! We can't have what we will not implement. But it is also true that we cannot implement what we do not have!

The church is more than the sum of its parts. But we must not forget that

the faith of a given congregation rests ultimately on the faith of its members in particular. Most of us shy away from what Karl Barth described as "I Hymns" and "I Piety." But Barth was wise in reminding us that our criticism of "I Hymns" and "I Piety" must always be relative and never absolute, for running through the scriptures are those attestations of faith in the first person: "The Lord is *my* Shepherd."

"This one thing *I* do." "He loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*."

Those who love this church can do nothing more or better for it now than to look to their faith. How is it with you and your faith? Do you prize your faith for the treasure that it is? Do you expose yourself to Jesus for the growth and enlargement of your faith? "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief." Let this be our prayer.

---

### PRAYER

Our gracious God and Father, we thank thee for the gift of faith and the power to struggle with our doubts.

Increase our faith, we pray thee, as in this fellowship we pursue together what it means to be thy people in a crooked and perverse generation.

So inspire our speech and direct our actions that others may come to faith through us. In Jesus name. Amen.

# The Spectacular in the Unspectacular

Sermon by  
HENRY S. GEHMAN

*A native of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, Henry S. Gehman was W. H. Green Professor of Old Testament at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1934-1958. An alumnus of Franklin and Marshall College and the University of Pennsylvania (Ph.D., 1913), Dr. Gehman is the author of a number of books and commentaries, including the well-known Westminster Dictionary of the Bible.*

*"But they that wait upon the LORD shall renew their strength;  
They shall mount up with wings as eagles;  
They shall run, and not be weary;  
They shall walk, and not faint." Isaiah 40:31*

LET us in our imagination go back about twenty-five hundred years to ancient Babylonia, where the chosen people of God are in captivity under the rule of the Chaldeans. Centuries before that time they had been in serfdom in Egypt, but in the Exodus there was a mighty deliverance at the hand of God out of the house of bondage. After their settlement in Palestine we can suppose that many a time they talked about the wondrous acts of God. Yet like ourselves they were a rather singular and ungrateful people; as in our own case, in the life of the nation frequently the marvelous works of God have been overshadowed by material prosperity, indifference to him, and a woeful lack of living in conformity to his law. In the end calamity fell upon the chosen people, and thousands of the Judeans were deported to Babylonia. There in a foreign land they were confronted by a new situation, but God did not desert them, for the word of God was kept alive through his prophets.

The words of our text take us to about the year 550 B.C. A new age was beginning to peer above the horizon. Through the gloom of despair a new era was at hand:

"Comfort ye, comfort ye my people,  
Saith your God."

In this chapter we have a hymn on the immeasurable greatness and power and wisdom of God, as displayed in the works of nature and in the divine government of the world. Instead of going to history, past and contemporary, the prophet of the Exile leads his people in sublime language to a contemplation of the creation of the universe and of God's maintenance of cosmic law and order. With this foundation the practical aim of the prophet becomes apparent; he wishes to point out the unbelief and the despondency of his compatriots and to inspire them with the true sense of the infinitude of God. And so he concludes the chapter:

"Why sayeth thou, O Jacob,  
And speaketh, O Israel:  
My way is hid from the LORD,  
And from my God my right escapes  
notice?  
Hast thou not known? Hast thou not  
heard?  
The LORD is the God of eternity,  
The Creator of the ends of the earth;  
He fainteth not, neither groweth he  
weary;



No man can fathom his understanding.

He giveth power to him who is faint,  
And to him without vigor he increaseth strength;

Even youths shall faint and grow weary,

And young men shall stumble over their own feet;

But they that wait upon the LORD shall renew their strength;

They shall mount up with wings as eagles;

They shall run and not be weary;

They shall walk, and not faint."

There in Babylonia the prophet knows that a deliverance out of captivity is in the offing. Out in the distant foreign land the prophet knows that a new Exodus is in the making and that in due time a chastened remnant will leave the land of Exile and return to the homeland of their forefathers.

A new era is coming—for those who trust in the LORD; it is only for those who will. The prophet has his eyes fixed on the future, but many of the exiles have no vision of God's purposes. "Why not let good enough alone? Babylonia is a rich country; it is far easier to make a living here than in little barren Palestine. We are a shrewd people. Here we have made money and can live in luxury. If the idealists be so foolish, let them dream of returning to the homeland." In answer to such thoughts, both expressed and unexpressed, the prophet reminds them of the greatness and majesty of God. He is the God of eternity, the Creator of the ends of the earth. But, after all, that may be small comfort. For what am I, poor, lonely, sinful individual in the sight of God? Yet the prophet says: "They that wait upon the LORD shall renew their strength."

God giveth power, strength, energy, and renewal, but there is a condition connected with his gracious gift: "They that wait upon the LORD." Literally this Hebrew verb means *to wait*, but this is not an idle waiting, not a listless waiting, not a waiting without purpose. The Semitic root has the underlying idea of *being strong*, of *remaining*, of *continuing*, of *enduring*. In other words, those who wait upon the LORD are those who hope against hope; they hope in spite of disaster; they continue to hope in spite of many a disappointment; they wait upon the LORD with trust in his purposes. They believe, yea they know, that in the end his will shall prevail, and through prayer they seek to place themselves under his will.

About twenty-five hundred years ago a prophet addressed the Jewish exiles in Babylonia; today that same man is speaking to us. We have been a prosperous nation; too long have we been depending on our commercial and military power. We have been quite complacent, and at last it seems that we are becoming disillusioned. In many respects, situations are similar in different periods of history. We too long for an Exodus out of confusion, fear, turmoil, and uncertainty into peace and security. The Hebrew prophet speaks with confidence of a source of power that is eternally valid, and in this year of grace 1972 we still have to turn to God. Yet questions will arise. How can we wait upon a God, who is the God of eternity, the Creator of the ends of the earth? Is there not an element of abstraction involved in the words of the prophet? Can we bring his vivid figures and his sublime language into our daily humdrum existence? Did not the prophet's contemporaries have an advantage over

us, since they could see how he lived in dependence upon God? They saw his unshaken confidence, and no doubt they were impressed by his convincing words and demeanor. Quite the contrary. Even though they lived close to the time and scenes of revelation, the advantage really lies with us; whatever element of abstraction there be in the prophet's conception of God, it may have been just as difficult for his contemporaries as for us. We know God not only through history and the words of the prophets, but through his Son, who took upon himself the form of a man and suffered all the ills of humanity. He knows our problems, because he endured them. In him we have boldness and confidence, and through faith in him we can say with St. Paul: "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." Through Christ we have strength, strength to undergird us, that strength which is the underlying concept of the Hebrew verb *to wait upon*. We begin with strength not our own, and through faith this will be continually renewed. And mark you, the verb rendered *renew* is in the imperfect tense; the action is not completed. In other words, this renewal is not yet finished; it is a continuing process.

Our faith in Christ gives us a momentum we do not have of our own; it gives us, as it were, a running start to accomplish our mission in life. "They that wait upon the LORD shall renew their strength." And then the prophet continues with three more lines of poetry:

"They shall mount up with wings  
as eagles;  
They shall run, and not be weary;  
They shall walk, and not faint."

Three verbal ideas confront us: *soar*, *run*, *walk*. Why this order? Is it not illogical? Is it not an anticlimax? No, the order is correct. It is not a descending scale, but an ascending one. We may soar by flashes, we may run by short sudden spurts, but we can walk only by long and sustained efforts.

# I

"They shall mount up with wings as eagles." All of us would like to soar. Why should I do the slow and grinding work, and not directly perform the things that appeal to me? Why should I have to start at the bottom, prove myself, and slowly work up? Let others meekly do the grind, but let me do the spectacular work and bask in the glamor which will bring me into the eye of the public. But what right have I even to suppose that in my case the laws of progress will be suspended? We grow from infancy to childhood, to youth, and to manhood or womanhood. It takes a number of years for the intellect to mature, and we cannot force it like a plant in a hothouse. Nor can we force a career; it has to develop normally.

"Heaven is not reached at a  
single bound;  
But we build the ladder by  
which we rise  
From the lowly earth to the  
vaulted skies,  
And we mount to its summit  
round by round."

There is no sense in our deceiving ourselves; yet many of us are deluding ourselves like children. We may kid ourselves day by day, but we cannot escape reality.

Many of us would like to do the spectacular and win applause before we are ready to receive it. Why should I endure the grind of going through the discipline of a theological course, when I am qualified now to preach and do it better than the old pastors? I went to Sunday School as a boy, and in college I had good courses in the Bible, and in the words of the Psalmist I am sure of one thing: "I have more understanding than all my teachers." Why should I spend weeks and months in writing a term paper, when Samuel Johnson could dash off a manuscript requiring no corrections and have it in the hands of the printer just before the deadline? Well, I am not Sam Johnson, and no doubt he could have accomplished more and better work if he had not been so indolent. It would be a wonderful thing if in the game of life we could always strike a home run. We should enjoy the exhilarating effect of hearing the cheers from the grandstand, and we would like to return a grin to the spectators. But more than once, after we have had the bat, there may reign silence, or we may hear the boos. And then there come to our mind a few lines of an old poem we heard in our childhood:

"Oh, somewhere in this favored  
land, the sun is shining bright;  
The band is playing somewhere,  
and somewhere hearts are light;  
And somewhere men are laughing,  
and somewhere children  
shout. . . ."

But there we are standing, confused, and crestfallen, for with our overweening ego we have struck OUT. It is but a flash from the sublime to the ridiculous. There is only one verb in the line: "They shall mount up with wings as

eagles," and no further promise is made. If we have been soaring in self-sufficiency or in self-righteousness, we shall have to help ourselves the best we can, in case we fall.

## II

The prophet proceeds from soaring to running: "They shall run and not be weary." It is more difficult to run than to soar, but easier to run than to walk. Sometimes, when we carry a heavy load, we walk very rapidly to reach our goal; it seems to go easier when we put forth an extra effort and quicken our steps and almost run. When children learn to walk, they do not move with deliberate steps; they make haste and almost run. And even when children can walk, frequently they would rather run in the house than walk. We too can run in time of crisis or under a mighty impetus. We like to see a young man running down the field and scoring a touchdown; that is the spectacular part of the game, when there is a mighty impetus, but we do not see the grueling practice which the athlete has to undergo every afternoon in order to qualify to perform the sensational. We often feel disappointed because we cannot in life continually make a series of touchdowns. We so much love to do what we suppose would be the unusual.

St. Paul compares the course of the Christian life to a race: "Do you not know that in a race all the runners compete, but only one receives the prize? So run that you may obtain it. Every athlete exercises self-control in all things. They do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable." And the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says: "Let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily

beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith."

We do not become weary in the Christian course, if we have faith. The verb *to become weary* has the sense of becoming tired from toil and exertion, or of having pain or suffering of body. Those who wait upon the LORD shall be eternally young in spirit; in a spiritual sense, those running on the Christian course or track will not have the aches, pains, and stiffness of old age.

### III

Finally the prophet says: "They shall walk and not faint." We have now come to the hardest part of the course of those who wait upon the LORD. Walking is not very spectacular, even in athletic training. In 1919 Jess Willard, who at that time held the heavyweight championship of the world, was knocked out by Jack Dempsey. In the course of the fight his legs became wobbly, and finally they gave way under him, and when the bell sounded for the fourth round, Willard remained lying on the floor. It was reported in the papers the morning after the combat that Willard had not done enough road work; he had been too lazy to walk long distances to harden his legs and to get them into trim. If we wish to succeed in any profession, even in teaching and the ministry, we must not be afraid of the road work. In fact, most great careers had no glamorous beginning. We have to work and grow. There may be nothing spectacular in being an instructor at a meager salary in a small institution, but at least it gives us an opportunity of showing the academic world whether there is anything in us or not.

The world will observe whether we can make a scientific contribution or not. Take it from me, it requires more rigorous discipline, and it is infinitely more interesting, to advance the total of knowledge than to stand idly by like Mr. Micawber waiting for something to turn up. If we cannot stand the burden and the heat of the day, we might as well quit. It may not be especially attractive to take a small church and work for a while in apparent obscurity, but in such a situation we have the opportunity of laying the foundation of a successful career. Sometimes we feel like saying to an inexperienced lad with an inflated ego: "Creep, my bairnie, creep, afore ye gae."

Much of life is outwardly routine. In whatever field of human endeavor our interests may lie, we have to reckon with the pedestrian element. A man may perform an act of heroism in rescuing a human being from a fire or from imminent danger of death; in a flash, a tremendous amount of courage and energy is released for a supreme and successful effort. We must not forget, however, that usually greater fortitude is required in our daily tasks and that it is more difficult to maintain unflinching courage day by day on an even keel than once in awhile to respond to a mighty impulse or to a sudden emergency. The making of a living can become very monotonous, but wherever there are human contacts, we can transform the most humble drudgery into attractive service both to God and to man. Christian character grows not by sudden spurts and irregular lapses, not by sustained efforts followed by still longer spells of indifference, but day by day in the patient exercise of faith. And if you suppose that the exercise of faith



is pedestrian, do not forget that it gives you the greatest opportunity for the use of your imagination. We are in life, as it were, on a pilgrimage, following Christ and day by day becoming more and more like him. But you will tell me: "I have faith, and yet I am a very imperfect individual. Every day I sin in thought, in word, or in deed." What you say is very true. We have failed in the past, we have failed today, and we shall continue to fail every day as long as we live. Of this, however, we can be certain: every time we sin and sincerely repent, we are one step closer to the perfect life of Christ. Every time we sincerely turn to God in prayer and seek his help, we are one step closer to the perfect life of Christ. If in this life we cannot reach his perfection, some

time in the life beyond we shall become even as he is.

The prophet says: "They shall not faint." The Semitic root has the idea of becoming exhausted. On the Christian way, however, we do not become exhausted; through faith in Christ our strength will be renewed continually, and like St. Paul we too can hear the words: "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." And as we continue on the Christian way, with the apostle we also can say: "Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in my infirmities that the power of Christ may rest upon me . . . for when I am weak, then am I strong." There is a certain paradox in the Christian life: the only time that we really fly or run is when we walk.

# The Christian's Joy

Sermon by

WILLIAM H. FELMETH

*A native of New Kensington, Pennsylvania, William H. Felmeth is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1939) and Princeton Theological Seminary (B.D., 1942). He served in the U.S. Army 1942-46 and for five years, 1946-51, was minister of First Church, Cranbury, New Jersey. For the past twenty-one years he has served as senior minister at the First Presbyterian Church, Basking Ridge, New Jersey. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of Princeton Theological Seminary and was honored by Bloomfield College with the degree of Doctor of Divinity.*

*"Rejoice in the Lord always." Philippians 4:4*

AFTER the service of ordination to the Christian ministry of a friend of mine, a sad-faced woman came up to him and said in mournful congratulation, "It's a grand thing you are doing as a young man—giving up the joys of life to serve the Lord." She seemed disturbed and suspicious when my friend protested that this was not so for him, that he expected to find a lot of pleasure in his work and that as a Christian, pastor or not, he expected to enjoy life.

The attitude of that woman reflected the feeling many people have that becoming a Christian, if you take it seriously, is to become so serious that all the joy is taken out of living. For them Christianity appears to be a depressing faith, with unwelcome disciplines and unnecessary restraints reluctantly assumed, which cramps life's style and crushes its exuberance of spirit.

Such an impression is created, at least in part, by those Christians themselves who don't understand or appreciate the spirit of their faith or who fail to show it in their living. Not so our Lord! He would have disagreed with the German author, Goethe, who wrote that religion

is entirely renunciation. He never asks his followers to give up anything merely for the sake of giving it up, but rather in order that they may have something better. He came not to destroy, deny and deprive life, but to fulfill, enrich and exalt it. He came that men might have life and have it more abundantly! So our forefathers, caricatured as dour men, were right when as they worshipped, they sang,

"All people that on earth do dwell,  
Sing to the Lord with cheerful  
voice.

Him serve with mirth, His praise  
forthtell.

Come ye before Him and *rejoice!*"

## I

Along with love and hope and faith, joy is one of the great and distinguishing marks of the Christian life and it is sorely needed today among us. In the church, all too often among congregations and leaders there is a heavy spirit, a downcast and defeatist attitude in the face of growing problems, difficult situations, increasing pressures, a readiness

to retreat into a kind of exclusive club or protected sanctuary. All too often there is the lack of zest and radiance among the members of the Christian fellowship, and instead, a kind of dullness, a grimness of resignation prevails.

The church is not alone in its need for the renewal and expression of joy. The world at large has a spirit of heaviness about it. Despite the scientific wonders of our age and man's increasing knowledge about himself and his environment, or perhaps because of these, beneath the noisy gaiety of our present culture you can detect a melancholy, a pessimism, a lackadaisical or resigned feeling of helplessness in the face of the world's trends, a numbness about it all.

There are those who anticipate man's eradication by mass destruction, man's inhumanity to man in appalling nuclear, chemical or biological warfare; by the overwhelming effects of the population explosion or by man's increasing pollution of his environment. Others assume that man will be obliterated by the dehumanizing effects of our present civilization, the automation, the computers, the numbers by which we are identified and by which our life is run. Much of what George Orwell's book *1984* anticipated is already terribly near or horrifyingly here. The present popularity of the song, "In the Year 2525," is evidence of our awareness of the likely direction man's existence is taking. Meanwhile we seem as a people to be enjoying ourselves persistently and vociferously—except that with the boisterous loudness of our laughter and the frantic pursuit of our pleasures, methinks we do protest too much about our joy in living! It looks like Nero fiddling while

Rome burned or "eat, drink and be merry for tomorrow we die." The joy is not real. It is counterfeit and will fail us in our need.

We said that true joy is the mark of the real Christian in faith and life. No religion faces the dark aspects of life as seriously as Christianity or grapples with its problems of pain and death, of trouble and sorrow, of sin and evil as earnestly and thoroughly. But its response, its answer, its insights, its solution to these are so exhilarating and wonderful that it still surpasses all other faiths in joyousness. What we have been given and what we bring to the world is not sad news but glad news!

Our faith begins in joy with the incredible announcement: "Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people—for unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord!" Jesus of Nazareth in his manhood was a joyful person. He took delight in the world about him, the beauty of nature and the activities of the workaday routine. He found pleasure in people, all kinds of people, saints and scoundrels, children, foreigners, scholars and *hoi polloi*, and they found pleasure in him with his exuberant spirit refreshing and exciting them. He likened his happy relationship to his followers to that of a bridegroom on a continuing honeymoon. Even on the night before his death, he spoke to his followers of his joy and theirs, and encouraged them to be of good cheer.

With his resurrection there came a resurgence of this spirit. When the wonderful news first came to them, the disciples disbelieved for joy! The Book of the Acts takes up the same spirit as it

tells of the first Christian fellowship worshipping and eating together with glad and generous hearts as they praised God. The apostle Paul now and again in his letters breaks into lyric happiness and specifically in our text of today urges his fellow Christians: "Rejoice in the Lord always! Again I will say—Rejoice!" The early Christians startled their pagan neighbors with this joy, for it came with freshness and hope to a jaded and despondent world.

One of these Christians, Hermas, had an insight which can help and encourage us, "The Holy Spirit is a glad spirit" and again he cautioned, "The sad man is always committing sin." The earliest statue that we have representing Christ shows the young shepherd with a long-sought lamb over his shoulders and a jubilant smile on his lips. Incidentally our faith is a faith of the young for the young in spirit. Its initiator was a young man and his followers were young and its spirit was marked with the exuberance of youth. It is to our misfortune that we have too often adapted and strait jacketed it to the sober ways and attitudes of those of us who are older, for all of us, old and young alike, need its pristine joy and excitement and enthusiasm.

We saints with sour faces have had much to do with the world's misunderstanding of our message and our mission as followers of Jesus Christ. We need to take the blame for words such as Swinburne wrote which depicted the Christ as the pale Galilean whose breath cast a gray pall over the world. There is something wrong with the way we have presented him and represented him to our fellow men if such is the effect on society. Far from being the pale Galilean, he is "Fairest Lord Jesus,

Ruler of all nature, O Thou of God and man the Son . . . Thou my soul's Glory, Joy and Crown."

So it is exhilarating to belong to Jesus Christ and we who are Christians cannot help celebrating. We celebrate Christmas and we celebrate Easter and Pentecost. We celebrate the Lord's Supper and we celebrate with glad and thankful hearts in our worship week by week. We celebrate "God with us" day in and day out. We celebrate the stewardship of life entrusted to us by him. We celebrate the unfolding drama of creation and God at work among us and with us. We celebrate the fellowship of love in which we are joined by the love of Christ. We have all this and so much more in which to rejoice! The focal point of our faith is a feast, not a fast, and we are summoned not to a funeral, not to go down to death, but to a festival of life both now and in eternity. So joy is ours as Christians!

## II

Do you and I know what joy is? Surely we have all experienced it in some form at one time or another! But can we identify what makes it so? It is not the same as happiness although we frequently interchange the words. Happiness is in good part man-made—a happy home, a happy friendship, happiness in work. These are the fruit of our achievement, one of the highest of which we are capable. But for joy we are not responsible. Those moments come swiftly flashing bright and lovely in our days like quicksilver: That moment of joy in just being alive. That moment of joy in love, expressed in flesh as well as spirit. That moment of joy in the unbelievable beauty of our world, the breaking of the "rosy-



fingered dawn" over the restless sea, or the white clouds serenely sailing across an azure sky. That moment of joy of being found when we were lost, of being forgiven when we have been wrong, of being together when we had been lonely and separated. Oh the joy of so much in our life!

Such joy is the gift of God. All joy is ultimately his even as all light on this earth ultimately derives from the light of the sun. Joy is not accomplished, achieved, fashioned or earned by man. It is given and received. We find it as we find a treasure by surprise or we are found by it as the wind finds the sail of our boat.

Joy is not the superficial transient gaiety of a New Year's Eve party with its gray unpleasant consequences of the morning after. Joy has an abidingness about it as it lingers in the heart and nestles deep within the soul to break forth in unexpected times and seasons. Joy is not dependent on pleasure, for pleasure is ephemeral, stimulated from outside of us while joy endures, coming from within. Joy is the antithesis of boredom which now so menaces the life of the modern western world. Did you see the cartoon recently which showed a droopy-eyed, yawning monster slowly moving down a suburban street absorbing its fleeing inhabitants? The caption read "Run for your life! It's boredom coming, spawned by technological advances and an overabundance of leisure!" More than a little truth is in this quip! To such a jaded western culture whose people are bored with themselves and surfeited with "*la dolce vita*" or pale imitations thereof comes again our Lord, Jesus Christ, with his gift of joy. Our faith in him, truly experienced in real commitment, brings

new zest and radiance to our spirits, new lilt and luster to our living, new enthusiasm in our being, all elements that make for joy.

This morning rather than having my lining out the occasions and causes for Christian joy, I suggest that you as a Christian ponder the reasons and sources of such joy, and then rejoice as they are yours! Begin with this insight: A man knows joy when he has confidence in something or someone outside himself for which he is prepared to give himself, as for example, when he trusts God and his goodness in life and is ready to commit self to him. Is not this the great understanding of the first question of the Westminster Catechism—"What is the chief end of man?" "The chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever"—to love him and to have your heart's true joy in him.

Or consider this: Joy does not thrive in a solitary and isolated situation. It comes as man responds to God and relates to man. Joy motivates, infuses, issues and derives from the fellowship in Christ and the outreach in his service. It is the fruit of the spirit absorbed in meaningful relationships and creative tasks which free us from self concern; it is found in the life that is gracious and kind, full of good will and generous in giving and forgiving. St. Jerome quotes a word of Jesus from an unknown source which illumines our understanding: "Never rejoice except thou hast looked on thy brother in love."

### III

Consider too how joy may come from God even in adverse circumstances because we trust his providence and believe in his benevolent action in the

world and in our life now and hereafter. Consider the joy that comes when life has meaning, purpose and makes sense because we have found the word and will of God for us and responded to it. Consider the joy that wells up when we realize God summons us to be his fellow workers, or the joy that is ours when we come to realize all things are in his hands and we are in his hands and nothing in life or death, in this world or out of it can separate us from his love which we have in Christ Jesus our Lord.

There is an abundance of occasions and causes for a Christian to be joyful but as the English author, Dorothy Sayers, indicts us, "Too many ordinary church people are guilty of so-called virtues like dullness, coldness and depression of spirits." An old Scottish "dominie" having heard his congregation whine slowly, glumly, and painfully through the metrical psalm, "O thou my soul bless God the Lord," scolded them, "If King David heard ye sing his psalms like that, he'd break his harp and take them away from ye!" Sometimes I wonder that God doesn't do the same with his blessings which he has given us, when we have and show so little joy in them.

As you entered the sanctuary today you may have seen the picture of this church and congregation painted some years ago by a local artist, a business executive. Be sure to study it as you go out, and consider what this says to us. When I called the artist to secure this picture for the church, he seemed puzzled that we should want it and then in passing comment he sought to assuage and encourage me by saying, "While the people leaving the church look glum and depressed, be sure to notice how large

the doors of the church are for I want to convey that while most folks going there miss it, within that place there is offered life and joy." "While most folks going there miss it"—For you and for me and for our congregation this coming season I crave the joy and life and power and exuberance of spirit which the apostles experienced at Pentecost and which all followers of Jesus the Christ are meant to have in their life, and not to miss!

In the French musical review of several years ago, "*La Plume de Ma Tante*," there occurred one of the most delightful moments I have ever experienced in a theatre: The curtain rises to reveal a band of ten or so monks of all shapes and sizes asleep on their pallets. The ropes to the bells in the monastery belfry hang nearby in mute inactivity. A shuffling yawning monk, the night watchman, comes in and nudges one of the sleepers awake to ring for matins, for early morning worship. This friar drowsily pulls the rope and his bell begins to ring and the rest rouse up reluctantly to start their pealing too. At first the sound is as half-hearted as the men at the ropes, but shortly a mischievous rhythm and a happy chime stir the group and they begin to skip and dance and swing a bit on the bell ropes. The sound grows ever more joyful and exciting and they bound around with carefree abandon. It all ends in glorious pandemonium, ropes intertwined, monks in a happy heap, the bells booming in glad harmony, the heart pounding for joy and the spirit exuberant with love and laughter. Who could help but come to worship with such contagious delight ringing through the air to summon us?

In this I find a parable—if we Christians can lay hold of our faith and

bring it to joyous life, like the monks swinging the ropes of their singing bells, it may rouse both us, and the world, to the great good news of the Gospel, God with us in Jesus Christ, loving us and calling us to love, to laugh with

gladness of spirit and to enjoy him! We Christians are both the recipients and the instruments of joy. I hope and pray that my own note expressed in word and deed and life among you this year will be that of joy. And what of yours?

---

## PRAYER

Eternal God of a thousand names of wonder, we praise Thee in our hearts for Thy Goodness, mercy and truth that mark this hour as a commencement of new life for all of us. Over many decades these ancient chapel stones, once heated in primeval fires, have felt the warmth of our love for Thee and the affection we bear for this Seminary. As each stone contributes beauty and strength to the arches, so does each one in this sanctuary offer his silent adoration and praise to Thee—students, families, faculty, trustees, and the unseen hosts who have preceded us.

Seeing we are surrounded by such a cloud of witnesses, help us to run the race that is set before us. Free us from those encumbrances of mind and culture which bind us to the past alone and liberate us from that rebellion which seeks only the future. Discipline us with strength and judgment to withstand the cruciform tensions of our humanity. Keep us, O God of the eternal, ever inquiring as students, and yet confirm our discoveries of faith over the years to know whom we have believed.

Lord, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Jesus, look with comprehending eyes upon our pathetic times. We cry for mercy and justice to be poured upon suffering mankind by the ministries of these graduates. Thou hast raised in times past prophets and healers of the spirit. Grant unto this eager assembly the diverse gifts of Thy Holy Spirit that, following after Thy Kingdom's purpose, they may bring peace to our barbaric era of electronic war; may bring bodily nourishment and spiritual nurture to souls in the humid stench of city ghettos; may bring courage and adventure to suave boredom of conventional life which is afraid to follow too late the convictions of its conscience.

Spirit of the Lord, whose loving kindness is beyond our most ambitious measure, fill afresh the hearts of weary graduates of past years who are far away from us with the same overflowing we petition for the new class of 1972. Surround all of them with a sense of Thy mysterious love, with the strength of Thy moral power, with the illumination of ever enlarging truth, that in this house of commencement, as in the latter day of their transfiguration, they may possess the joy of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen.

(Prayer offered during the 160 Commencement Exercises, May 30, 1972, by the Rev. Bryant M. Kirkland, D.D., Minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, N.Y.)

# Is Judas a Scapegoat?

Dialogue Sermon by  
STUART G. LEYDEN

*A native of Brooklyn, New York, the Rev. Stuart G. Leyden is an alumnus of Wheaton College, the University of Edinburgh (B.D., 1962) and of Princeton Theological Seminary (Th.M., 1963). At present he is minister of the Presbyterian Church, Easton, Maryland.*

**W**HAT about Judas Iscariot? Is he a scapegoat? He was one of the intimate twelve who followed Jesus in his wanderings throughout Palestine, sat at his feet, was entrusted with the money, and he is the one who betrayed Christ. Has Judas received an unfair trial in the minds of Christians throughout the centuries?

Christian theology teaches that Jesus died for the sins of the world; that you and I and every living soul are implicated in the atoning death of Christ. Might it not be in our interest to fix blame on one person rather than accept our responsibility for the crown of thorns, the nails, the spear, the crucifixion? Has Judas become for us a convenient scapegoat?

Perhaps there is evidence from the New Testament itself which, if used skillfully, could get Judas off? It would be nice if we could demonstrate his innocence. We could save the reputation of an innocent man who is being used to hide the guilt of others.

Let's listen in on the Judgment Day of Judas Iscariot. Judas is in the witness stand and his lawyer is defending the case.

*Defense:* "Judas, tell the court why you did what you did. How is it that you are accused of betraying Jesus and causing the death of an innocent man?"

*Judas:* "Well, you see, I was following orders."

*Defense:* "Whose orders, Judas?"

*Judas:* "God's orders. It was God's will that Jesus should die."

*Defense:* "Perhaps you ought to explain to the court what you mean by that."

*Judas:* "Well, you see, Jesus had to die in order that the scriptures be fulfilled, and I just happened to be the unlucky chap whom God chose to do the dirty work."

*Defense:* "You mean to say that you were an instrument of a higher authority?"

*Judas:* "Yes, I was the agent of God to betray Jesus. In fact, if you read the record in Matthew's Gospel, Jesus himself said, after I kissed him in the garden, 'All this has taken place that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled, that it might be so.'" (Matt. 26:54).

*Defense:* "Thank you, Judas." "Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it is quite clear that Judas was only obeying a higher authority. The highest sort of authority. He was an obedient and loyal Israelite, and did his clear duty. I would remind the court that if this man is convicted, then the consequences for our people will be disastrous. The morale of all our people would be undermined. Who will ever obey God's will again if he knows that he could be brought to trial for obeying his orders. Judas, do you wish to say anything else?"

*Judas:* "Yes,  
'My mind is darkness now—My God  
I am sick



I've been accused and you knew all the time.

God! I'll never know why you chose me for your crime.

For your foul bloody crime

You have murdered me. You have murdered me!"

(from *Jesus Christ Superstar*).

*Defense*: "Don't step down yet Judas. You say that you are sick."

*Judas*: "Yes, I'm sick."

*Defense*: "Do you mean you are mentally disturbed, or were mentally disturbed when you decided to betray Jesus?"

*Judas*: "Yes."

*Defense*: "Explain to the jury how that was so."

*Judas*: "Well, you see, Satan entered into me. You can read about it in the Gospel of Luke, chapter 22:3, and John 13:27. Satan entered into me and made me do it. I couldn't help myself."

*Defense*: "Well, that may be so. But is there any other evidence you can produce to show that you were mentally disturbed?"

*Judas*: "Yes, I was so upset over Jesus' death that I went out and hung myself. Suicide is surely evidence that I was not in control of myself."

*Defense*: "Were there any other circumstances which might have contributed to unsettling your mind and causing you to panic?"

*Judas*: "Yes, indeed. We were in a dangerous situation. Jesus had angered all the religious authorities. They were out to get him, as you know. The Romans were afraid of an insurrection. Why, even the children shouted, 'Hosanna!' when he rode into town. It was a very tense situation and I was afraid

what might happen to me and the other disciples. They would soon be after us."

*Defense*: "Thank you, Judas. You may step down now."

"Ladies and gentlemen of the jury: it is clear to me that Judas was in no condition of mind to make a fully rational judgment and cannot be held responsible for betraying Jesus or causing his death. As his attorney, I cannot help feeling that we are making a scapegoat out of Judas. If any one should be on trial it should be the higher-ups, the religious authorities who gave him encouragement, and Pilate, who gave the order for crucifixion. Furthermore, we are all sinners living in an evil world. We are all to blame for what has happened. Let's not salve our consciences by making an example or scapegoat out of Judas. That's all I have to say. Your verdict must be 'Not Guilty.'"

The prosecuting attorney is given his chance to sum up his case against Judas.

"Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the defense has tried to show that Judas was simply acting under orders from God, that he was an instrument of the divine will.

"It seems to me that our understanding of God's will for Judas and for each one of us must be consistent with our God given sense of human responsibility. If there is no human responsibility, then there can be no judgment day, and this court is unnecessary.

"It is evident that Jesus held Judas responsible for his act when he said, 'The son of man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the son of man is betrayed!' Matt. 26:24. Judas interprets Scripture in such a way that he is absolved of all responsibility. I would suggest—no, I would allege—that Judas is using Scripture to

suit his own purpose. Let God be his own interpreter of Scripture, not this man.

"I would remind you that we have from Judas' own lips the confession to the chief priest and the elders saying, 'I have sinned in betraying innocent blood.' He did the deed, and we have witnesses to prove it." (Matt. 27:4).

"As for his mental condition. We know that Judas was capable of premeditated rational action. He struck a bargain with the higher authorities for 30 pieces of silver. He later realized that he had done wrong. Normal people go through the same process.

"The defense has also produced a scapegoat theory. I have nothing but contempt for that. Yes, I agree that others higher up ought to be tired too. Their day of judgment will come in due course. But today we must decide about Judas. As for the theological ploy that we are all implicated as sinners in the atoning death of Christ, I can agree to some extent. I have no quarrel with those who teach the universality of sin, or the universal benefit of our Lord's death. But let's not say that because we are all guilty, that no one is guilty."

"That sort of rationalizing will lead to moral chaos. Responsibility must be fixed, pin-pointed and dealt with, or else all hell will break loose in heaven as well as on earth.

"I am surprised that the defense did not drag in the greater atrocities of the Roman soldiers. Did not Herod slay all the innocent children in an attempt to kill Jesus as a baby? Therefore, the death of Jesus should not cause us so much concern. Let me remind you that judgment begins with those who value justice and who would commend it to others. We are responsible for keeping our own house in order. Judas is one of us, and we may hope and pray that the enemy, and indeed the whole world, will learn something when you pronounce Judas, *Guilty*.

"As for the sentence which Judas must receive, I cannot advise the court. But remember this—if Judas will confess publicly again, 'I have sinned in betraying innocent blood,' and openly repent of his evil-doing—then you may be merciful."

And let every sinner do the same. Let us cast ourselves upon the mercy of Christ who died to save us from our sins.

# Fleeting Glimpses

An Easter Sermon by  
DONALD R. PURKEY

*Minister since 1965 at the Presbyterian Church, Franklin Lakes, New Jersey, The Reverend Donald R. Purkey is an alumnus of Miami University (Ohio) and of Princeton Theological Seminary (M.Div. 1961). For the past five years he has been also a Teaching Pastor with the Department of Field Education at Princeton with direct responsibility annually for two theological students in his parish program.*

CHRIST is risen! He is risen, indeed! And he goes before you into Galilee. He will meet you on roads and in strange pathways on your way to Emmaus and to all the cities of your going and coming. He is a Christ who comes in fleeting glimpses and one that you cannot grab hold of and keep with you. For our propensity is to make idols, our tendency is to want to keep him, to corral him, to domesticate him, and to control him, but he will not be controlled.

Man, the great idol maker, wants to make even of the resurrected Christ an idol. Anthony Padovano, a priest and a teacher at a nearby Catholic seminary would remind us in his recent book, *Free to be Faithful*, "No idol is allowed to the faithful man who asks God to be his Father. God may take away the security of one's own life as he did with his Son. The Father, however, never destroys an idol to leave us empty but only to make us notice the Easter we were missing."

## (I)

We will have missed Easter completely if we think that we can somehow capture the risen Christ. I am amazed as I read again the gospel stories concerning Christ's post resurrection appearances. He is unwilling to stay with his disciples for any length of time. Rather he appears and then he disap-

pears. He comes to them to be with them only for a few minutes and then he leaves. One can catch the concern, the wonder, and the hurt that those two men felt as they broke bread with the Christ. They thought they had him and all of a sudden he wasn't there any more.

Christ comes in those unexpected moments, in those surprise experiences all of us have had, when he gently tugs at our sleeve and says, "Look, look around, you can see me." And then he's gone. He understood us when he talked to his disciples in that beautiful passage in John when he said, "A little while you'll see me and in a little while you won't see me." For it is no constant vision that God gives of himself. If God were so heavily present that there were no escaping him, where would be our freedom? God did not make us robots to turn to a risen Christ only at Easter, but gave us freedom to turn to him when he plucks at the sleeve, when he dances in laughter and when he comes to us in the tears of our brother and we know he is there.

The gospel writers knew that Christ would come in those fleeting moments. This should cause us to wonder and think when he may come to us again as one risen and free, to lead us, to lead us out of our own captivity into new possibilities and into new places. If we insist on making an idol of the resur-

rected Christ we may fashion and form a beautiful thing we can put on the shelf and look at but as we reach to touch it, it will become as dust like old and moldy manuscripts and it will crumble in our hands. No, you can't capture him for he is freer than we are. He is free to pull us out into new places and in new ways with that gentle tug on the sleeve saying, "Look around you. I'm here for just a moment."

The women who went to the tomb had a mystical experience. I've never had a mystical experience, although it is a part of the tradition of the church. I don't put it down and I don't denigrate it. They came across a Christ in a supernatural way and they were so ecstatic that they went chasing and running to find the disciples saying, "I've seen him! I've seen him! I've seen him! But he has disappeared and I don't know where he is." The history of the Church is replete with men and women who have had this kind of experience, beginning with the Apostle Paul who falls on his face in blindness on the road to Damascus when the risen Christ confronts him. Christ greets him and turns his life around and sends him out into strange territories and lands to proclaim a new freedom. And there are countless others—St. Theresa, St. Francis. He goes off to die, away from his followers, to be with the risen Christ, only to discover there in the clasping of Christ's hands into his own that Christ's stigmata has been placed in his own hands. I don't understand this. I cannot comprehend it for I haven't experienced it. But I must allow others to have this experience, to know the Christ in the fleeting glimpses of the mystical experience.

## (II)

More likely I find Christ in a group. When I have gathered with brothers and sisters around a cause or an issue and we feel put down and defeated and when we know that our cause is just but the forces around us seem so oppressive that we can't possibly make it and all of a sudden into the mix of our relationship there appears a new dynamic, a new possibility and it isn't ours. It is larger than the parts of us all put together. Somehow there is some presence interjected into our midst, a fleeting presence, at best, that gives us a new kind of cohesiveness, a new kind of resiliency to do the work of God. When our brother is crushed and oppressed, Christ stands there in the midst for a fleeting glimpse to be with us.

I've been in homes and around tables when our hearts have been poured out in intercession for others, when we have cried and asked for God to be present in the life of another who was hurt or maimed by disease of body or spirit. I know what it means to feel a new interjection of peace, a new hope that is larger than all our little hopes, the presence of one who gathers it all together and puts it into a new perspective. I know that where two or three are gathered together in his name the promise is that he is there, yes, for a fleeting glimpse. Not long, not long enough that you can control him or manipulate him, but there long enough that you know, you know that you can move on to find him again.

The two men on the road to Emmaus were dull of mind. Their whole intellect had been damaged by the death of their friend that they couldn't think any more. We get like that, don't we?



Whenever we are hurt our minds go to sleep and we can't comprehend. But Christ begins to lay out the Scripture to these two pilgrims. He begins to tell them about God's faithfulness with man in all these events, through Israel's history, through the prophets and through his own life. We as Protestants are people of the word. The Bible is one of the chief symbols of our faith. Yet we do such a lousy job of believing it and interpreting it. Perhaps it is the most published book, but I find it among the least read. It becomes too often a household ornament rather than an instrument of understanding. But it is there that you might get a fleeting glimpse of the Christ as Martin Luther did as he began to translate the Galatian letter and he caught a new vision of what human freedom was about. Or take a John Wesley who is at a prayer meeting and opens his Bible to Romans and discovers what it means to be justified by faith. God through his Spirit can take those verses, those words that are nothing without his Spirit and open them up to us in such a way that we can feel that tug at our sleeve and we know that the risen Christ is there, speaking to us only a few words but enough to keep us going on.

### (III)

Finally, it is not any of these experiences that touch the Emmaus road disciples. It is when they go off the road into a room to sit down to supper. Christ takes a loaf of bread and breaks it and then they knew. When we come to the table this morning there is a host here. He breaks the bread for us to say, "I care. I care beyond your wildest imagining and I will be with you in all your moments, if only in fleeting

glimpses and I will sustain you with this food and with this drink so that you can make your journeys into the Galilees into which I lead you. Foreign and strange countries though they be, I will be there with you."

Dag Hammarskjöld, one of the great mystics and believers of our generation, wrote shortly before his death this prayer poem.

Have mercy  
Upon us.  
Have mercy  
Upon our efforts,  
That we  
Before Thee,  
In love and in faith,  
Righteousness and humility,  
May follow Thee,  
With self-denial, steadfastness, and  
courage,  
And meet Thee  
In the silence.

Give us  
A pure heart  
That we may see Thee,  
A humble heart  
That we may hear Thee,  
A heart of love  
That we may serve Thee,  
A heart of faith  
That we may love Thee,

Thou  
Whom I do not know  
But whose I am.  
Thou  
Whom I do not comprehend  
But who has dedicated me  
To my fate.  
Thou—

We can never comprehend the Christ for he goes before us. He'll stop only long enough to tug at our sleeve and

say, "Come along." He has apprehended us. He has brought us within the circumference of his love in such a way that our lives can never be the same again. As you come to the table this

morning, I pray that with me and with others you may get that fleeting glimpse that will give you the strength, the courage and the freedom to follow that Christ wherever he will lead.

# Can the Pulpit Recover Its Authority?

by JOHN R. BROKHOFF

BOTH world and church are experiencing today an erosion of authority. This is an age of defiance and rebellion against the authority of the Establishment. In the secular world we see its expression in deliberate breaking of laws, lack of respect for courts and police, rebellion on college campuses, and the refusal to obey military orders.

The church, also, is suffering from an erosion of authority. This is particularly seen, for example, in the Roman Catholic Church. A leading Catholic theologian, Hans Küng, has caused a furor with a book questioning the doctrine of papal infallibility. At the close of the Bishops' Conference in the Fall of 1971, *Time* commented, "Most bishops may still listen to the Pope, but fewer and fewer priests listen to either the Pope or the bishops—and many of the laity are beginning to listen to no one." (November 15, 1971, p. 84). *Newsweek* reported the results of a Gallup poll which shows a wholesale disregard of the church's teachings: 58% ignore the Pope's condemnation of birth control; 50% want the church to stop opposing abortion; 2/3rds want the church to halt opposition to divorce; and 53% think priests should be allowed to marry.

The loss of authority in Protestantism, however, can be seen specifically in preaching. If one thing can be said

*Professor of Homiletics since 1965 at Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., John R. Brokhoff is an alumnus of Muhlenberg College (A.B., 1935), University of Pennsylvania (M.A., 1938), and Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia (B.D., 1938). Dr. Brokhoff served pastorates in Virginia, Georgia, and Pennsylvania, and is the author of numerous publications including This is the Life (Revell, 1959).*

about the present state of preaching it would be that it lacks authority. In fact, some teach that authority in preaching is obsolete. They claim that there is no place in today's world for proclamation that is authoritative. This is the age, they claim, for inquiring and seeking. The day of the authoritative word is gone. Preaching now should be characterized by tentativeness, opinions, and anticipation. Writing in the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* (March, 1971) Richard Ray says, "A society which is increasingly tolerant of religion and moral diversity may eventually determine the form of a clergyman's homiletical enterprise. In other words, there may soon be no place for the authoritative style" (p. 52). Is it any wonder that sermon time for many is drop-out time? How many people today take preaching seriously enough to listen and obey? The church is not getting a hearing today because the pulpit lacks the accent of authority.

Yet, at the same time, the world and the church are hungering for some authoritative word they can believe and obey. For too long the church has been listening to the world. The time has come for the church to speak positively to the conditions of modern existence. In recent years the church has also engaged in dialogue, but this has proved

to be little more than an exercise in the futility of mutual ignorance. In the history of the church, her finest hour has always been when she proclaimed her message with authority: "Thus saith the Lord." The world's salvation and the church's renewal demand that the pulpit recover its authority.

Where does the pulpit get its authority? How can a man in the pulpit, like Jesus teach with authority? What are the sources of a preacher's authority? It may be well for us to look at places where his authority is *not* to be found.

(i)

First, the preacher's authority is not in himself as a man. He cannot base authority on his personal piety, personality, or public image. In spite of this, some today hold that the preacher himself is his own source of authority. Richard Ray writes, "The clergyman is discovering that the source of his authority in a congregation lies in his ability rather than in the sanctity of his feelings or his personal beliefs." If this is the case, authority fluctuates according to the talents of a preacher.

(ii)

Also, the preacher's authority does not reside in his congregation. In *Leave it to the Spirit*, homiletician John Kilinger claims, "The center of gravity is not in the Bible but in the contemporary congregation. . . . The preacher must turn to the Bible, in other words, not as a book whose authority is ipso facto in itself, but as a clue—indeed, an impressive clue, to the meaning of human existence. . . . Actually, the majority of parishioners gave up the notion of the preacher's infallible authority a long time ago—if indeed, they ever

held it. The real authority for preaching has always been in the listeners themselves. They choose to hear or not to hear. They decide on the person in whom they will rest authority."

If Bohren is correct, "A sermon must come from the community," the claim that a preacher's authority comes from the congregation may be valid. However, the Scriptures claim that a prophet is a spokesman not of the people but of God and that the message comes directly from God. If this is true, a preacher's authority comes from God and not from the people who hear the message.

(iii)

In the third place, a preacher's authority is not the product of hermeneutics. The authority of preaching does not reside in the preacher's understanding of the Word, but in the Word itself. If this were the case, authority would be a subjective matter rather than an objective "Thus saith the Lord." Pulpit authority does not come from an explanation of the words of the Scripture. Rather it comes from listening to the Word through prayer and study. In facing the same problem in his day, Luther said, "They determine what can be God's Word, not by starting from God who speaks it but starting from man who receives it and then they still claim it is God's Word."

Where then does a preacher get his authority? What enables him to speak from the pulpit authoritatively? His authority has a manifold source.

(1) God. God is the ultimate authority, the source of all authority. Paul claims, "For there is no authority except from God" (Rom. 13:1). This applies not only to preachers but to secular governmental officials. God gives au-



thority to men to speak and act in his behalf. As the Son of God, Jesus claimed all authority. (Matt. 28:18; John 17:2). With this authority he taught (Mk. 1:22), forgave sin, and cast out demons. (Mk. 2:10; Luke 11:14-20)

(2) Word. Since God has all authority, his Word is authoritative. Because it is his Word, it is both permanent and powerful. This Word is recorded in the Bible. Thus, preaching to be authoritative must be biblical. This does not mean the Bible as page and letter is authoritative, but it is authoritative only when and where God speaks in and through it. The authority of the Bible does not reside in the words of the Bible, for not all the words of the Bible come from God. It, moreover, does not exist in the men of the Bible even though they may have been religious geniuses. If this were the case, men outside the Bible—Augustine, Luther, Wesley—could be as authoritative as those in the Bible. The authority of the Bible is not even in the theology of the Bible, for a theology is only the thinking of mortal men. It is their understanding of the truth, but their understanding may be incomplete or erroneous.

The Bible is authoritative because it proclaims the Word of God. Preaching cannot be authoritative unless the sermon is a faithful exposition and application of the Word. Today's pulpit has lost its authority because it has largely ignored the Bible as the source of its message. The reason for its non-use is the loss of faith that the Bible is the Word of God. In a four-year study of a particular denomination in Detroit, Lawrence J. Kearsten found that only 10% of the clergy and 29% of the laity

view the Bible as God's Word and entirely true.

Preaching will not become authoritative until preachers recover the conviction that the Bible is the true Word of God. The opinion of the Bible held by many in our day was expressed by Gordon D. Kaufman: "The Bible no longer has unique authority for Western man. It has become a great but archaic monument in our midst. . . . It contains glorious literature, important historical documents, exalted ethical teachings, but it is no longer the the Word of God (if there is a God) to man. . . . For the more secular, whether in the church or out, the waning of Biblical authority has often been experienced as liberation from archaic moral standards and mythologies to savor and enjoy to the full the possibilities of life in the 20th century. . . . We are in a new historical situation with a new awareness of our own autonomy and responsibility to think through what we should do and by what means we should guide our thought and lives." (*Interpretation*, January, 1971, p. 96).

To recover its authority the pulpit must once again accept with wholehearted conviction the position of the Reformers: the Bible is the sole authority in matters of faith and life. It is not an authority in any other area whether it be science or sociology. But when it comes to the ultimate questions concerning God, man, and the relationship of the two, the Bible does speak authoritatively because in and through it God himself speaks. When a sermon expresses this voice of God found in the Scriptures, it demands and deserves the people's respect and obedience to its authority.

(3) Truth. If the Bible is God's

Word, it is a book of moral and spiritual truth revealed by God through the ages. Truth has its own inherent authority. Falsehood is uncertain and apologetic even though at times it puts on a bold front to appear authoritative. Truth does not have to be defended or protected from falsehood. The truth can take care of itself in the midst of its enemies. All we can do for the truth is to proclaim it. Then, the truth is self-authenticating. When it reaches the listener, it bears witness to itself as truth. The hearer acknowledges it as the truth for him and he accepts its authority.

If today's pulpit lacks authority, it may be due to the fact that preachers have not been proclaiming the truth of God as found in the Word. The fact is that the majority of sermons today do not deal with the truth of God but consist of the preacher's ideas, opinions, and reactions to the world situation. Seldom do you hear a preacher say, "This is the absolute truth—believe it!" Rather you hear, "May I suggest this proposition to you for your consideration?" Some hold that a preacher is supposed to communicate himself to his congregation as a genuine human being. A group of San Francisco clergymen prepared a statement which in part said, "In the sermon the minister is communicating his own personality." What a minister should be communicating is not his own personality, but the person of the Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ. Phillips Brooks had a better idea when he defined preaching as truth through personality. Paul taught that we should not preach ourselves but Jesus Christ as Lord. (II Cor. 4:5)

(4) Ordination. Since God and Christ have all authority, all other authority is

secondary and derivative. Because God is God, all other authorities, even Satan, are subject to God (Eph. 1:21). The authority a preacher has is an authority given him to be exercised as a faithful steward. Christ shared his authority by giving it to his disciples, then and now, to forgive, to heal, to exorcise, and to preach.

A preacher is called by God to speak his Word. This call is confirmed by the church at his ordination. At this time he has authority conferred upon him, authority to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments. The bishop or presbytery says to the Ordinand: "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God and to minister the holy sacraments in the church." From this moment the newly ordained preacher is authorized to speak in the Name of God.

Here is an authority that is granted by Christ through his body, the church. He can now speak and act authoritatively in the name of Christ. Similarly, a minister is authorized by the state to marry. A college president confers degrees upon the authority granted him by the board of trustees.

This authorization makes a difference. The preacher is no longer just another person. He is a commissioned, called, and committed man of God who as God's ambassador and spokesman speaks with the authority of the one who ordained him to his task. Authority resides in the person who speaks. If a man is a parent, his child will usually respect his authority because of the fact that he is his parent. If someone without authority gives an order, the usual reaction is, "Who does he think he is?"

After ordination, a preacher is more than an ordinary man. Some, like John

Killinger, do not acknowledge this fact. He writes, "He cannot hope to be relevant as a voice of authority, a bearer of the Word or an ultimate source of wisdom and understanding. He cannot even pretend to carry off his act as an expert in the Scriptures or theological inquiry. . . . What he must be satisfied to be . . . is a man, a sensitive, creative, poetic figure, grappling with the problems of being human and secular and while in our time, a sharing both the quest and its results with other individuals around him. This is finally the only justification for his being paid a salary to be a minister." Would Christ or the church buy this? A preacher is not paid to be a human being among men, but to be a man of God among men that men might know and hear God in their midst.

The time has come for modern man to get a new appreciation of the clergyman. For too long he has been just another good fellow who was nice to have around. The laity have been encouraged to regard him as just another human being who may be handy to have near by, especially during crisis. There is something very special about an ordained man. He is a human being, to be sure, but he is a specially called man to represent and to speak for God in a very special way. When he enters the pulpit, it is a man, but more than a man—he is a herald, a representative, an ambassador of the Almighty. As and when he declares God's Words, he speaks with the very authority of God. And they who are of God recognize the voice of the Shepherd.

It is one thing to have the authority of God, his Word, and his authorization to preach his Word, but it is another thing to communicate this au-

thority in one's preaching. How does a preacher express authority in his sermons that his congregation senses the authority?

## I

This authority comes in various ways. First, authority in preaching results from the one who is speaking. A true preacher never speaks for himself or of himself. He speaks for God and not only about God. He omits as far as possible any reference to himself. The sermon will be God-centered rather than egocentric. If the preacher bases his sermon on himself and his ideas, the sermon will have no more authority than the man who is speaking. He may be a great man—an Edwards, Phillips Brooks, or a Fosdick—but this man's authority is nothing compared with God's authority. One of the weaknesses of contemporary preaching is its egocentricity. In a recent sermon a nationally known preacher referred to himself *seventy-seven* times! To be authoritative for the people, the sermon must echo and re-echo the old prophetic phrase, "Thus saith the Lord." This is none other than God speaking his Word through the voice of a man. If a preacher wants to preach with authority, he will remove all phrases such as: "I believe," "I think," "I suggest," "I question," etc. In place of these, he will say, "God says."

## II

Moreover, authority comes into preaching through the convictions of the preacher. People sense and accept authority when the preacher speaks as though he means and believes what he says. By his attitude and spirit a preacher communicates authority. He can be

positive without being offensively dogmatic because he knows God is speaking through him, because he is declaring the Word of God, and because he has been duly authorized by God through the church to preach.

Accordingly, authority in preaching depends upon whether the preacher believes what he is saying. He is supposed to speak out of deep convictions which are a matter of life and death to him. Today's lack of authority in preaching reflects the shallowness of the clergy's convictions concerning Biblical truth. In a new book, *Wayward Shepherds*, the results of a study of 1580 Protestant clergymen in California are revealed. According to this report, only 67% of the pastors are certain of God's existence, 61% of Jesus' divinity, and 69% believe that acceptance of Christ is necessary for salvation. If only a little more than half of our Protestant leaders are convinced of the basic teachings of the Bible, contemporary preaching is in a tragic condition. This is sufficient explanation for the erosion of authority in today's pulpit. Authority will not be recovered until preachers get convinced of the truth of God's Word. How that can be accomplished is another problem.

### III

In addition, authority comes into preaching when the preacher speaks with a note of certainty. This naturally follows speaking with conviction. If a preacher is unsure of himself or his message, he cannot command respect for authority. If he hems and haws, the people yawn. One timid preacher said in his sermon, "If you do not all repent, after a fashion, and confess your sins, so to speak, you will all be damned, as it were."

How can a preacher be certain in a day like ours? Many have reached the conclusion that the only certainty is that nothing is certain. Because of the critical approach to the Bible, who can be certain of a text or even be sure the words of Jesus are really his words? In a day of fast-changing ideas and values, it is no easy task to stand before a people and say, "Ask me what great thing I know!" Today's preacher cannot be certain about many things, but he can be certain about the essential truths of the Faith. Because he knows and believes the Bible as God's authentic Word, he can be certain in declaring those truths. With positive conviction, he can declare forthrightly, "Repent or perish" and "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and you will be saved." At the close of each explanation of the three articles of the Apostles' Creed, Luther declares, "This is most certainly true." It is not simply that the Creed is true, but *most certainly* it is true. There is no shadow of a doubt, no hesitation, no uneasiness. This is the truth—believe it, accept it, obey it!

### IV

In the fourth place, authority comes through in preaching because the truth being preached has authenticated itself in the life and experience of the preacher. He speaks with authority because he deeply feels the truth he proclaims. He is a man of experience with God and God's truths. He has seen the truth work out. The promises of the Word have been experienced not only in his own life but in the lives of his people. With Paul he can say, "I know in whom I have believed." When he speaks of God's love for the sinner, he is speaking from personal experiences of an amazing



grace, when he explains that "the wages of sin is death," he can verify this in the lives of his parishioners. The Word of God is also the deed of God. The Word is not only spoken, but is enacted in practical, daily living. The authority of preaching is the authority of personal experience.

To preach with authority is also to preach with power. The Greek word, *exousia*, is used in the New Testament for both "authority" and "power." Authority is identified with power, for authority is valueless without power. A man may have the power to command, but unless he has power to enforce his directive he becomes a laughing stock.

When preaching is performed with authority, it becomes dynamic preaching. By the authority and power of the Word proclaimed, evils are exorcised, men repent, sinners find grace, and the world is changed. That is why we need not be ashamed of the gospel, for it is power of salvation. The power of preaching is not in the power of the preacher's personality or techniques, but in the power of the authentic Word of God he preaches with authority. Through the church God once more says to his spokesmen: "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God." And, we might add, preach it with authority!

# Hermann Kutter: Pioneer Social Theologian, 1863-1931

by JÁNOS PÁSZTOR

(This article, edited by Elmer G. Homrighausen, Dean and Professor, Emeritus, at Princeton Theological Seminary, is based upon the central aspects of Dr. János Pásztor's doctoral dissertation which was accepted by the University of Debrecen, Hungary. Dr. Homrighausen writes as follows:

"I was visiting Dr. Pásztor and his family, outside Budapest, in the charming historic village of Szent Endre (St. Andrew), where he was pastor. I was shown his dissertation and upon examining it asked him if he could possibly produce an article based on it which would point up the contributions Leonard Ragaz and Hermann Kutter in the shaping of modern theology. The dissertation dealt with this subject but related it to developments in Hungarian theology. Dr. Pásztor thought it could be done. He worked at it during the time he was preparing to leave his parish to teach Theology at St. Paul's Theological College in Limuru, Kenya. It was from Limuru that the article was finally sent. Dr. Pásztor's contribution is in bringing for the first time to English-speaking students of Barth's theology and to students of modern European theology, the social theology of one of the two great Swiss leaders: Hermann Kutter. I think readers will sense that social theology is nothing new on the Continent, and that Kutter is a pioneer in this aspect of theology. He may interest and enrich us greatly who think that American Christians invented the 'Social Gospel.' He had a powerful influence on Barth as a person and as a theologian. I have added a few remarks about the Blumhardts, father and son, and Leonard Ragaz, who were also associated with Social Theology, and the theology of Barth and Tillich.")

**H**ERMANN KUTTER and Leonard Ragaz are pioneers of Christian social theology. They are practically unknown in the English-speaking Christian world. This is surprising because of the widespread opinion that North America is the home of the social Gospel. And yet, Kutter and Ragaz were pursuing the social Gospel in their European situation with a zeal and a depth that is unknown to advocates of the social Gospel in America, except perhaps it be Walter Rauschenbusch or Reinhold Niebuhr.

Hermann Kutter and Leonard Ragaz had a profound influence upon Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen, an influence that never ceased to affect these

men in their long ministries of teaching, preaching and writing. One can detect this influence in Barth's *Dogmatik*, even though he did turn away from some of Ragaz's views, which in some ways were carried on in the theology of Paul Tillich.

Two other persons must be mentioned in any discussion of Kutter's social theology: the Blumhardts, father and son, who believed profoundly in the real victory of Christ over evil powers in personal and social life. Both believed in the relevancy of Christ's victory for social life. Human history was a stage (*Schauplatz*) for the glorious coming of God's Kingdom, which is not to be confined to the church. That coming

includes secular movements like the Social Democratic Party. Christians must be "in the streets," and participate in the struggle for social justice along with Marxist socialists in solidarity with the proletariat.<sup>1</sup> The son Blumhardt actually participated in politics. The Blumhardt's dominant faith that God was involved in history, and that the Kingdom of God as making significant breakthroughs in society affected both Kutter and Ragaz, and through them Barth, Thurneysen, and in many ways Tillich as well.

The Younger Blumhardt saw the Kingdom of God as the fulfillment of all social needs. This concept was made the basis of a perverted German theology by Adolf Stoecker.<sup>2</sup>

### Kutter

Hermann Kutter was born of a Swiss middle-class family, and brought up in a pietistic home. He studied theology at the Universities of Bern and Basel. He was minister of a village church Vinelz-am-Bielersee from 1887 till 1898. Then he was called to the charge of Zurich-Neumuenster. From there he retired in 1926. He served his cause by preaching and by the numerous books he wrote.

In his theology, biblical realism is welded together with idealist philoso-

phy. According to Karl Barth, who was always ready to acknowledge his indebtedness to Kutter, he was an "irregular dogmatician."<sup>3</sup> He never wanted to be a dogmatician at all. His desire was to preach. That was what he wanted to do even when writing on philosophical subjects.

In his view human history displays a constant tension between man and the powers of Immediateness (*Das Unmittelbare*) out of which man has fallen, but from which he has never been able to detach himself completely. Its remnants are always present in his life as a vacuum which longs for fulfillment. But that desire can never be fulfilled. The original harmony of life has been broken into pieces and has been replaced by isolation and anxiety with all its evil consequences for society. Religion also reflects this brokenness. It is Immediateness imposed on man from without. It is characterized by a constant split between worship and ethos in spite of the attempt to create harmony out of its immanent resources. But Immediateness revealed itself in the life of Israel, then in Jesus Christ, who reinstalled the direct communication with the Immediateness, and brought harmony and unity thereby. Christ displayed in His life the powers of direct communion with God. His coming is an *anti-religious* phenomenon. With Him there is no room for human

<sup>1</sup> Cf. George Casalis, *Solidarität mit dem Proletariat: Christoph Blumhardt*, d.J., in *Christliche Glaube und Ideologie*, ed. by Klaus von Bismarck and Walter Dirks (Stuttgart, Kreuz-Verlag, 1964).

In Bad Boll there is an Evangelische Akademie devoted to Christian Social Work, cf. Marvin Brown, "Social Counselling": *Work of the Evangelische Akademie at Bad Boll* (New York, Union Seminary, 1968).

<sup>2</sup> Kutter's complete bibliography is in Hermann Kutter, Jr., *Herman Kutters Lebenswerk* (Zurich, EVZ-Verlag, 1965).

<sup>3</sup> The Christlich-soziale Arbeitspartei of Adolf Stoecker was based upon an ideology of nationalism, loyalty to the Kaiser, political and theological antiliberalism and antisemitism. Cf. Markus Mattmüller, *Leonard Ragaz und der religiöse Sozialismus* (Zollikon, Ev. Verlag, 1957), pp. 23 f and Andreas Lindt, *Leonard Ragaz, Eine Studie zur Geschichte und Theologie des religiösen Sozialismus* (Zollikon, Ev. Verlag, 1957), p. 253.

achievements. His death was a result of the life-and-death-struggle of religion against God, and was also the victory over religion.

But it was not the final victory as yet. The struggle continued after the Incarnation with one break-through of the Immediateness after the other: in the Reformation, and later on, when the Churches of the Reformation lost contact with the Immediateness by replacing Christ with doctrines and became "religions." But, the powers of Immediateness broke through in secular fields, first of all in philosophy and then in socialism. Thus, the history of Christianity is characterized by a duality. Even in its worst periods the elements of Immediateness have always been present in it.

Kutter's personal conviction, what he preferred to call his "certainty about God" (*Gottesgewissheit*), shines through even his theoretical writings. He never gave up emphasizing that it is God who is to be taken seriously not man, not even the faith of man (*Gläubigkeit*). The object of faith is not the believer but God. He is in the centre. His Kingdom is coming to bring salvation in all spheres of life. It is the task of the Church "to be there for God" (*für Gott da zu sein*), to get involved in life for the Kingdom and to proclaim Christ so that salvation might be accomplished (*vollbringende Heilsaufgabe*). She has to preach that God is present in history. If she fails to do this, she will lose her flavour and cannot be salt and leaven in the world.

Christ's salvation must not and cannot be limited to man's inner life, or be deferred to the realm of the last things beyond history (*Jenseitigkeit*). To limit the effects of salvation to the "immortal

soul" is an unbiblical, Greek idea. Man is not divided into two parts, not even the pious man. He does not have two separate entities in himself. Soul and body are organically and inseparably united. In Christ the Word became flesh and salvation is unfolded in the life of matter. Therefore, the Gospel has a radical "this-worldliness" (*Diesseitigkeit*).

Whenever the Church forgets this, God uses other instruments to remind her. So the materialism of Marx is used. Marx helps the Church to understand the importance of matter and to do away with the dualism of Greek philosophy which has ruled Christian thinking for many centuries. The result is the uplifting of "this-worldliness" for the sake of the things beyond history, the characteristic looking into heaven instead of working for the Kingdom on earth. That tended to turn the Gospel into an *ideology* for the protection of the ruling classes and to make the Church a hot-bed of hypocrisy. Those who spoke about the vanity of earthly things usually enjoyed them most. Others who took this teaching seriously sacrificed their lives for false ideas.

For Kutter the Kingdom of God meant that under His rule everything in the world is directly related to Him. As Eduard Thurneysen's evaluation of Kutter's theology puts it: "Kutter had the courage to go back, cutting across all intermediate grounds and causes, to the *prima causa* of all need and help, to God. . . . He knew about one thing only: to seek God, to understand God. Who else has done that with the exclusiveness of Kutter? Everything he had to say was born out of a tremendous effort to speak of the One."



God's radical involvement in history in Christ, His active presence in man's situation does not diminish human responsibility, as one might expect, but intensifies it. The coming of the Kingdom calls man to work for it. That work includes social action. The means by which the call is extended is the Word of God. Kutter never elaborated a doctrine of the Word. But it was a living reality for him. Like the prophets of the Old Testament he spoke out of God's reality for the contemporary situation. The Word was for him the trumpet-call of the herald announcing the coming of the Kingdom. It was the light that illuminated the human scene. It was the voice that interpreted events and demanded obedience. It was the power that turned the attention of the Swiss village parson to the burning social questions of his day. When he confronted them, he was guided by the Word which comes from beyond, but is always concrete and relevant. His whole approach to the social problem having been derived from the Word of God saved him from offering his own social program and religious ideology on the one hand, and, on the other hand, from being satisfied with empty religious slogans and pious generalities. In this way he was enabled to cut through religious and secular ideologies and manipulations and to be relevant at the same time. Speaking about social problems he spoke about God. By doing this he firmly established the possibility and necessity of an organic relationship between personal faith and responsible social action.

But it is not possible to speak about God without calling to repentance and obedience. Repentance is the result of the recognition of God's dealings with

man and man's failure to apprehend and obey. Kutter felt, therefore, compelled to preach the Word and interpret the events in its light. With the burning passion of Jeremiah combined *and* the sober logic of a theologian, he turned to "Christian Society" and to his fellow-ministers to urge them to realize that God is at work even in the socialist movement. The social problem is a human problem. But Christ also became human to form history by the power of love. The same love can be detected in the dedication to social justice on the side of the social Democrats. The church ought to encourage them and make them conscious of being the instruments of God by her preaching:

"O, where is the Word to answer their longing? Where is the absolving, encouraging and creating Word? Church, why don't you stand up for the 'idealism' of the Social Democrats? Surely, the Lord has given you the Word, the implacable, sharp, wonderful Word for the poor and the oppressed, the Word of liberation for the creature that yearns, the righteousness of the living God. Only the Word has the power to disclose constraining passions . . . and to give an expression that offers solution to this modern movement. You have got the Word. The Social Democrats have not. They fight and fume with a great wrath . . . the storm will sweep them away. O, give them the Word."<sup>4</sup>

Kutter used very strong language against the Church when he saw that

<sup>4</sup> Hermann Kutter, *Sie müssen! Ein offenes Wort an die christliche Gesellschaft* (Zurich, Müller, 1904).

English translation: *They Must, or God and the Social Democracy* (Chicago, 1908).

she was unwilling to see and accept the challenge. There are few theologians who exercised stronger criticism about the disobedient Church than he did. The Church "has refused the abundant life offered by God to mankind in the Gospel." Therefore, "she stands like a withered tree with bare, fruitless branches, motionless, lamed without inner life," and the task is being taken over by secular forces, namely by the Social Democrats. What they demand is nothing but the consequences of the Gospel apart from the Church. In the same breath he turns to the Social Democrats to say that by denying the Gospel they deny their own roots and act against themselves.

For, according to Kutter, not only the demand for a just social order, but revolution itself is supported by the will of God. The driving force of every progress is revolution and progress prepares the way for a new revolution. Therefore progress has an eruptive nature:

"Revolutions are the volcanos of Eternity in history. . . . The greatest of all revolutions is when man encounters God and understands Him. Sometimes man slumbers in the shadow of the Eternal. . . . Suddenly he is awakened and grasped by Him. . . . That is the coming of the dawn of a new age, an age of revelations which is full of promises of the future."<sup>5</sup>

The "absolute powers" of the Eternal came to mankind through Christianity. Therefore it has been a means of progress. Yet the relationship of Christianity to progress is dialectical, as it is re-

flected in the relationship of Christianity to culture. It is never satisfied with what has been achieved, but always strives forward. In this way it is opposed to achievements of progress and brings about a new one. Therefore Christianity is revolutionary in its essence. Without its driving force, or to use the phrase of Arend Th. van Leeuwen, without its "ferment of change"<sup>6</sup> the world would remain in static quietism doomed to final decay. The absolute claims of Christianity bring health to mankind. Therefore it would be foolish to try to dispose of the Eternal, or to separate the absolute from human progress as it is done by the Social Democrats. Man is only man so far as Eternity permeates him. The prophets of Israel, the coming of Jesus, the Reformation, the French Revolution and Social Democracy are the real revolutions of history. In common they strive for the Eternal. They all have been driven by the powers of Eternity. Any attempt to put them into the framework of a system of thought has been futile and misleading, because neither of them has been able to take hold of the essence of that power. Christianity, too, is more than its doctrines. The philosophical "experiments" of Karl Marx are not adequate expressions of the essences of the social revolution. Its materialistic foundation is a "historical misunderstanding," and also a historical necessity owing to the opposition of the Christian ideology of bourgeois society. Yet, Kutter is convinced it is bound to change. The more the Church is willing to support their just claims the sooner it might happen. The support given by the Church might also perform a useful service in avoiding the use of force.

<sup>5</sup> Hermann Kutter, *Wir Pfarrer* (Leipzig, Haassel, 1907).

<sup>6</sup> *Sie müssen!*

Kutter speaks about the question of using force for the sake of achieving the aims of revolution in the book that brought forth more controversy and exercised more influence than any other of his writings.<sup>7</sup> It was meant for the public, not only for theologians. According to contemporary sources its publication had the effect of an explosion. Kutter wrote it in the heat of the struggle. This may account for the inconsistency in his statements in it about the use of force. It also may be taken as rhetorical technique, a means of persuasion. He says: "The living God uses force." (*Der lebendige Gott braucht Gewalt*.) Society based upon the power of Mammon has no right to condemn the use of force, because its own rule is maintained by the same, and because even the bloodiest revolution is less terrible than the evil-doings of everyday exploitation. Revolution is compelled to use force to bring about its downfall. But against the dominion of Mammon, i.e. capitalist society where money and property are the great idols, the living God Himself is the greatest threat, "the most violent revolutionary, the most relentless subverser," who will sweep away the society which is interested only in protecting its own privileges. In order to carry out His judgment God is reaching far out toward the atheists, and will use even force, if necessary. This "if necessary" is important. He meant what he said as a warning. In spite of the strong language he did not absolutize the use of force. That was rather the *ultima ratio* in his thinking. If Church and society were ready to repent and stand by the just cause of the exploited masses, they might turn away the necessity of using force. (That was written in 1903.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

Have these words no relevance for the world-wide situation in our days?)

In spite of being a Swiss and very conscious of the heritage of his own nation, and in spite of his criticism of conditions prevailing in the *Reich* of the *Kaiser* he looked at the German people with loving anxiety, especially during the First World War. Out of his anxiety a book was born in which he addressed the German nation.<sup>8</sup> In it he tells how anxiously he watches the spiritual struggle of the German soul. He saw promising signs in the German appreciation of the values of inwardness (*Innerlichkeit*) reflected in the great tradition of philosophy and in the growth of the socialist movement. But he also recognizes the threats of nationalism, false respect of authority and militarism:

"Will you Germans be able to find which is more than German which is human . . . or will you shut the doors before these values of inwardness and will you pour upon the world something which is nothing but German (*ein blosses Deutschtum*). . . . By doing this you would humiliate and destroy what might have grown out of your life. Then the moment will come, as it has come for many, when you will be judged and the idol of your Germanness will be destroyed."<sup>9</sup>

Karl Barth and many others thought very highly of this book, which again showed his prophetic insight.

Karl Barth and his close friend Edvard Thurneysen had been given even earlier many impulses by Kutter's writ-

<sup>8</sup> Hermann Kutter, *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, (Jena, Dederichs, 1916).

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21

ings when seeking the way of a relevant and powerful expression of faith: Kutter's seriousness about God, his desire to take his stand in Him alone, and the emphasis placed upon the proclamation of the Word. His social responsibility derived from the Word of God and viewed within the coming of the Kingdom of God which freed him from all stains of ideology also had a great appeal for them. The friendship of those early days continued until the death of Kutter. When Barth was professor in Munster, he invited Kutter to lecture to his students. That lecture is the best summary of Kutter's Christology.<sup>10</sup> But at that time he had some reservations about Barth's theology.<sup>11</sup> But it never spoiled their friendship. Barth and Thurneysen regarded him as their teacher and friend. But, as often happens, the disciple had far outgrown the master. Yet it does not minimize the respect due to any master within the circle of them who all want to remain disciples of the only Master.

### Ragaz

Leonard Ragaz (1868-1945), a contemporary of Hermann Kutter, was reared in a liberal theological family,

<sup>10</sup> "Jesus Christus und wir," *Zwischen den Zeiten* (1929), pp. 397 ff.

<sup>11</sup> He thought there was little emphasis on the Kingdom of God in Barth's theology. In the 2nd edition of *Römerbrief* he sensed the danger of monism and docetism. Cf. Hermann Kutter, Jr., *op.cit.*, pp. 117 ff.

Remarks of Kutter on Barth's theology can be found in his letters to Maria Pilder, the Hungarian translator of both of them: January 26, 1929; March 4, 1929 and March 13, 1929. This unique correspondence of about 81 "theological" letters—so I have been told—is going to be published by Professor Max Geiger of Basel.

and after studying theology in Basel, Jena and Berlin, and serving as a pastor in two parishes, became professor of Systematic Theology in Zurich. In 1921 he resigned to dedicate his life to religious socialism, writing and lecturing until his death. His pilgrimage according to his autobiography went from pantheism to a personal God; from God to the Kingdom of God; from the Kingdom of God to Christ. The Kingdom was the rule and activity of God in history. History was also a source of revelation. He welcomed Darwinism and related it to the reality of progress in and the fulfillment of history. The Incarnation is not once-for-all; there are many incarnations, such as the Franciscan movement, the Reformation, the Renaissance, humanism and democracy. Ragaz had an optimistic view of history. He deviated from Kutter because the latter emphasized the God-action in history too much. He was afraid that this emphasis might lead to pharisaism, quietism, and isolation. Barth also broke with Ragaz and sided with Kutter. Ragaz did not like Barth's otherness of God, and his move towards systematic theology. And Ragaz believed that Barth betrayed religious socialism, but later was reconciled when Barth took a strong stand in the Barmen church struggle. Ragaz is the real ancestor of Tillich's religious socialism and the social theology of Harvey Cox.

Of course, these Swiss social theologians worked within the context of their European situation. They never had the opportunity to test in practice what they proclaimed. But they were motivated by the strong conviction that they were called of God. Their social theologies had deep roots.

Perhaps these Swiss social theologians



and those who are associated with the social or radical Gospel in North America may well listen to each other, for they have contributions to make to each other which would help to overcome the unwarranted polarization we now have

between the personal and the social Gospel advocates. For a study of both schools points towards the profound depth and the ecumenical breadth of the Gospel's reality in personal and socio-human life.

# The Glory of the Cross

Gideon G. Scott

The dark and dreadful deed is done!  
The Christ is dead!  
Beneath the sullen, sombre sun  
He bows his thorn-crowned head.

A good man was the Nazarene.  
In all he did and said his love was seen;  
But he offended those in power,  
And they contrived this awful, evil hour.

They took him in his prime, when only thirty-three,  
And on a cross exposed his shame for all to see.  
He taught the power of love, but hatred won the day:  
He claimed that he was Lord, but cruel men had their way.

They led him to the hill, where he was crucified.  
He spoke of life, yet on that cross at Calvary he died:  
He healed the sick, but there in bitter pain he bled:  
He said he came to save; "Himself he cannot save," they said.

Twelve he called and gathered to his side.  
"You shall my disciples be," he said.  
One betrayed, and one denied,  
And all the others fled.

As death loomed near he felt abandoned and alone  
And in his desolation cried in anguished tone  
To God, by whom he felt forsaken.  
Was he after all mistaken  
In the way which he had taken?

In God he put his trust, his Father he obeyed;  
Yet death, defeat and suffering seem the price he paid.  
Despised by men, by God rejected—  
Grief-stricken and dejected—  
Is this what he expected?

Is not his brutal death upon the cruel cross  
The vivid verdict of defeat?  
Have love divine and human hope not suffered loss?  
For death is final and complete.

Were his sufferings and sorrows in vain—  
All his agony, anguish and pain?  
They seem meaningless now he is dead;  
For his death contradicts what he said.

\* \* \*

"It is finished!" is his cry.  
See the man of sorrows die.

"It is accomplished!" His work is complete.  
His is the victory, not the defeat.

"It is fulfilled!" He is victorious;  
Not abject in his death, but glorious.

For the fate which was his was in no way his due.  
In the deeds which he did and the words which he spoke  
He was upright and pure, he was faithful and true.  
Even suffering and pain could no anger provoke.

No unjust treatment he received could undermine his love.  
For those who murdered him he prayed for pardon from above—  
"Forgive them, Father, for they know not what they do."  
Right to the end his faith was firm, his trust was true.

Nor did he lose his love for God,  
For whom the way of death he trod.  
He came that all mankind might live,  
But he for this his life must give.

His perfect love for God and men held fast.  
For those who took his life he prayed with dying breath.  
He also loved his Father to the last,  
Even though he asked of him that painful, shameful death.

Jesus' wondrous work is done!  
Evil's vanquished! Love has won!  
His is not the victim's shame:  
His the glorious victor's name!

Of history God is the Ruler and Master.  
In the light of the cross it can be understood  
That he is at work in defeat and disaster,  
Turning death into life, and evil into good.

\* \* \*

Not good but evil on the cross was slain,  
And God and goodness reign.

For doubt and darkness could not conquer light,  
Nor wrong confound the right.

And in that ultimate and cosmic strife  
Death could not vanquish life.

The ways of God are not the ways of man.  
By faith and hope and love he will fulfil his plan.  
What men count strong, by God is reckoned weak.  
The earth shall be possessed by those who are the meek.

In Jesus' death all norms and judgments God set right;  
For triumph lies with right and not with might.  
He chose the strength of faith to overcome the strong,  
And sacrificial love to conquer wrong.

The first Easter dawn is for ever the token  
That faith is the power which can never be broken.  
Whatever men do and whate'er God may ask,  
Obedience and love can fulfil every task.

Both in this life and in the grave  
God is omnipotent to save  
Through him, who once was cruelly slain,  
But whom he raised in power to reign.

In all our temptations our Saviour's endurance  
Has given us confidence and reassurance.  
By rising in triumph he has from the tomb  
Dispelled the dread darkness, the fear and the gloom.

The great and glorious deed is done!  
The Saviour lives!  
The victory of faith he won  
To us through faith he gives.

(This poem was written by the Rev. Gideon G. Scott, minister of Wester Coates, Parish Church, Hampton Terrace, Edinburgh. A graduate student at Princeton Theological Seminary, Mr. Scott received the degree of Master of Theology in 1962. He has had articles and sermons published in *The Expository Times*).



# The Preacher's Syndrome —A Ministerial Malaise

by JOHN R. GRAY

*Minister since 1966 at Dunblane Cathedral, Scotland, the Reverend John R. Gray is an alumnus of Trinity College, Glasgow, and of Princeton Theological Seminary (Th.M., 1939). He served as a chaplain in the Royal Navy 1941-46 and was minister of St. Stephens Church, Glasgow, 1946-66. In July 1969, Mr. Gray lectured at the Institute of Theology at Princeton.*

"IT doesn't get any easier as the years pass, does it?" The speaker was a very wise, very senior physician, and a first-rate churchman too. What he said is true. The ministry, if it be a really caring ministry, is an exhausting business, costly physically, psychologically and spiritually. Other people's sorrows, other people's quarrels, other people's pain, take their toll; and public speaking of any kind, keeping control of an audience or a congregation, is a very tiring thing, whether one feels it to be so or not. But the Sunday services have to be taken, the meetings are to be presided over, the funerals and marriages conducted, and the people visited in joy or sorrow or worry or simple, old-fashioned cantankerousness. So one goes on, week after week, month after month, year after year, giving no public evidence that the reserves are low until—something strikes. It may be some personal disaster or family worry. It may be some physical illness or even some unlooked-for demand in the parish. Whatever it is, it lays bare the fact that one has no resources upon which to draw.

I suppose I am getting to the "old-stager" stage, or at least sufficiently near it to be the repository of my younger brethren's confidences. Over the last few years an increasing number seem to have been coming to me, saying how difficult they find it to go on. They are

all suffering from some sort of psychosomatic illness—vaso-vagal symptoms, fast-beating heart, sleeplessness, constriction of the throat when speaking, stomach upset, back pain, or dizziness. All have this in common: they are terrified of Sunday morning. In many cases their terror goes back to an incident when they had some physical ailment and tried to soldier on despite it. At some point in the service their head swam, they felt faint, near panic invaded their whole being, shaking knees and a feeling of desperate exhaustion. Subsequently, in some cases, they discovered that they had a "bug"—influenza, food poisoning or whatever. Whether a physical disease was diagnosed and dealt with or not, the next time and every time they returned to the pulpit, all the experience of dread and agitation and panic returned. How common this sequence of events, this preacher's syndrome or minister's malaise is, it is impossible to estimate. I would be grateful for correspondence on the subject. I would hazard a guess that something like one minister in three is afflicted in this way at one time or another, that some who leave the ministry do so for no other reason, and that many in the ministry are made much less effective by such symptoms than they would otherwise be. Is there any general advice or particular hints which can be given about the matter?

Diffidently, I would offer the following:

1. First of all, if you have none of these worries, be more thankful than proud. Take care of your resources. Save your strength for things worthy of it and for the sudden heavy calls you may be called upon to meet. It is capital which is steadily being diminished, so do not dissipate it.

2. Take reasonable time off and reasonable rest and exercise. You are no more exempt from the ills the flesh is heir to than any one in your congregation. God does not ask you to kill yourself. Christ's constant marvel was that people should get so hot and flustered when after all God had given them twelve hours in every day.

3. Periodically review your commitments. Don't offer incense on every wayside shrine. Are you contributing to anything but your own breakdown by being on this, that and the other committee?

4. When you have been in bed, take the time off which the doctor orders, even if you feel you could be visiting or writing letters. If your visiting doesn't take it out of you, it is not worth doing anyway. What you lose in time will be less than the days you would lose by going back too soon. Preaching or taking funeral services are certainly not jobs for a convalescent.

5. If you already have some or all of the symptoms I have described, do not be ashamed. They do not prove that

you are unsuited for the ministry—perhaps the opposite. But do not try to treat yourself. Do not betake yourself to the too convenient drug or barbiturate or to your wife's sleeping tablets. Request a thorough medical examination with, if necessary, referral to a consultant physician. If some sort of sedative or tranquilising tablets are prescribed, do not be ashamed to take them—as prescribed.

6. Make sure you are breathing properly and speaking properly. Forced voice and shallow breathing can be a fruitful source of panic. One minister was cured by some simple lessons in voice production.

7. Realize that the "scene" you so much fear is most unlikely to happen. Of all the men who have come to me in their distress, not one has ever fainted in public nor behaved in any fashion obvious to the congregation. They felt that they were going to faint, were sure that "people" would notice, but it didn't happen. Once the medical treatment is put in hand, seek out an older minister whom you can trust and tell him the *whole* story. Illness should not be faced alone.

8. Determine that you will emerge from the experience a wiser and a better minister and that the Grace of God, discovered anew by you in your own need, will be the more freely available for those who seek it through your ministry.

# Faith and Tolerance: An Introductory Investigation

by LAWTON W. POSEY

*Minister since 1967 at the First Presbyterian Church, Welch, West Virginia, Lawton W. Posey is a native of South Carolina, with degrees from Davidson College (A.B., 1957) and Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia (1960). A writer of articles for Christian Ministry and the Christian Century, Mr. Posey is a contributor also to the devotional quarterly, These Days.*

*"... whoever is not against you is for you." Luke 9:50  
"As the time approached when he was to be taken up to heaven,  
he set his face resolutely toward Jerusalem." Luke 9:51*

JESUS was not prudent. His total commitment to what he perceived to be the will of his father drove him to make the last journey to Jerusalem. This was the journey (and he knew it) that would end in his death by execution. Luke tells us that he determined *resolutely* to go to Jerusalem. Here is the obedience of faith.

As Luke has it, Jesus made this move in the context of conflict with his disciples, who when confronted by rejection by the Samaritans on the one hand and by the actions of an exorcist who was not of their group on the other, attempted to get Jesus to destroy his enemies.

Jesus refused to use coercion or divine power to bring his adversaries around and thus aroused feelings of hostility and doubt in his disciples. He was able to deal creatively with these feelings, but he was never able to eliminate them entirely. He was not able to dissipate the anxieties of Judas, so Judas, perhaps hoping to force the hand of Jesus, betrayed him into the hands of enemies.

Portrayed in these stories are two "models of life." That which comes through strongest is the dedication of Jesus. Perhaps somewhat less strongly,

but importantly, there is the model of tolerance for those who differed with him.

Jesus was able to combine in his own life the power of absolute commitment with a deep concern for persons. He was obedient, yet compassionate. Because he loved deeply, he transcended the tension between faith and tolerance.

People who follow him today have great difficulty being both faithful and gracious, obedient and tolerant.

The "true believer" finds it difficult to understand those who differ from him in matters of faith. A tolerant person often lacks a powerful commitment to a particular vision of the truth.

Because Jesus loved *persons* deeply, he was able to combine these qualities in his life: While making his ultimate sacrifice he reached out to people: The thief, his mother, those who crucified him, all were recipients of his great concern. Yet he could not protect his closest friends or his enemies from the consequences of his complete dedication.

Does this shed some light on division in the church? I believe that it does. Many of our divisions stem from the actions of equally dedicated men, but at least some of the problems of the

church arise from the conflict between the totally dedicated person (liberal or conservative) and the people who style their lives around a "live and let live" policy of tolerance. Jesus shows us a way to get around this problem.

I believe that Jesus offers a model for Christians in his concern for *people*, a model which will allow us to combine in our own lives and in our churches, the basic intolerance which faith demands with tolerant understanding of those who choose different paths. Here, the priestly ministry and the prophetic calling are united. A heavy commitment to truth ("going to Jerusalem") is tempered by profound mercy toward men ("He that is not against you is for you").

This concern (call it love, if you will) makes it possible for us to walk with Jesus to Jerusalem while understanding

the people along the way who will not walk with us. While not a *solution* to the paradox of tolerance as opposed to commitment, it is at least a way of living with the tension.

Reinhold Niebuhr stated the paradox in these words:

"Loyalty to the truth requires confidence in the possibility of its attainment; toleration of others requires broken confidence in the finality of our own truth." (*The Nature and Destiny of Man*, volume II, page 243).

One test of Christian faith is in our ability, by the love and grace we have perceived in Jesus, to live with this paradox, to transcend it if possible, and to walk with him in the bondage of commitment and the freedom of love.



# Each in His Own Native Language

Reflections on Three  
Theological Conferences

by EDWARD M. HUENEMANN

*Presently an associate for Theological Studies with the Division of Evangelism of the United Presbyterian Church, Edward M. Huenemann is a native of Wisconsin, with degrees from Mission House College and McCormick Theological Seminary. After serving several pastorates in New Jersey he received the degree of Doctor of Theology from Princeton Seminary in 1961.*

ATTENDANCE at three international theological consultations during the past year led me to careful rereading of the story of Pentecost in Acts 2. That story provides a basis for understanding both the promise and the danger in the contemporary international theological scene. What will here be regarded as signs of promise may by some "proper" theologians be regarded as an invitation to the kind of theologizing done at college beer parties. That is the risk the Acts 2 account invites one to take.

The three theological conferences were gatherings of "proper" theologians. Most of the participants were professors of theology. In each instance there was recognition that the way the theological language game had been played was now inadequate. Discernment of a proper present direction was the paramount issue, but at none of the consultations was clarity on that issue achieved.

The Bonhoeffer Congress meeting in Düsseldorf, Germany, addressed the theme "Faith and Politics." There was no want of insightful interpretation of Bonhoeffer (many of his friends and colleagues were present). The theme of the conference allowed for penetrating analysis of the present situation both politically and culturally. Focus on is-

sues, specifically racism, prevented preoccupation with esoteric concerns. What might have been a nostalgic reunion of Bonhoeffer friends was in fact a serious attempt to assume theological responsibility in the present.

In spite of the best of intentions, some excellent papers, and obvious commitment to the present task the theological dialogue was marked by touches of scholasticism and academic preoccupation which confirmed the belief that theology proper must serve the canons and the function of the schools in ordering concepts and purifying the language game. Yet that theological discipleship in the Bonhoeffer sense, means much more than that was highlighted in almost every presentation. The dialogue of this congress might be broadly characterized as a quest for a more meaningful way to play the theological language game in order to fulfill discipleship in the political (public) arena. The discussion ended with modest claims and slim rays of hope. Which political issues were sharply enough focussed in the public mind to merit specific theological critique did not become clear. The more general question of dehumanization in a technological revolutionary age was the chief concern. One came away with the impression that a

number of European theologians feel unequal to their task. That may itself be a sign of hope.

A second conference held in January, '72 at Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda, stood in sharp contrast to the first. Here too the quest for a more meaningful way to play the theological language game in order to fulfill the call to discipleship in the public arena was a primary concern. African theologians (also mostly professors of theology) from more than a dozen countries spent a week together addressing the theme "African Theology and Church Life." The number and range of specific issues demanding immediate attention reflected the revolutionary character of life in Africa today. Tribalism, eschatology, the meaning of the arts, the doctrine of the trinity, sacramentalism, monogamy, political authority, property rights and profit, worship, theological education, faith and healing, and pentecostalism were only some of the topics which demanded attention in the rush to make necessary decisions about matters that concern the people of the church in Africa. Here too the theologians felt unequal to their task, but not because the public questions lacked focus but because they were far too numerous for any group to deal with in so short a time. Here a young church is forcing theology out of the schools into the arenas of the common life and no sacred canons are able to control the movement. Here the frontier experience of the early church is alive in the twentieth century. Here there is urgency to distinguish the reality of pentecost from the powerful influences of pentecostalism. (More on this at the conclusion of the article.)

A third theological conference at the Bossey Institute in Switzerland in June '72 addressed the theme "Doctrine and Change." An ecumenical gathering of theologians spent five days discussing the theme from the perspectives of the major Christian traditions both east and west. The theologians' sense of faithfulness to tradition warred mightily with the desire to cope with rapid change. A basic christological focus was to provide the fulcrum for ringing the changes on the theme. For the most part the classical traditions provided enough of a common language base to make open and free exchange of ideas possible. Though there was common recognition that even the theological scene was changing rapidly the dialogue was largely an exercise in rearrangement of traditional pieces. The fact that the whole conversation was now taking place in a new and different house was less frequently acknowledged. I believe that here too participants recognized that they had made only a small beginning in the obedience and faithfulness now required of them. Must doctrine change? To what extent? How? To what end? What might be meaningful new formulations? The weight of these questions increased as the discussions continued but only hints as to how to bear the burden of these questions emerged.

Three conferences of professional theologians. All interesting. All well planned and purposefully designed. Each a gathering of capable and talented people. Each beneficial to individual participants in diverse ways. None of the conferences seemed wasted effort in private or personal terms.

But more than private benefit is to

be expected from such assemblages. One such more than private benefit emerging from attendance at the three conferences is the clue such attendance provided to how the theological dialogue might most properly move in the community of faith today.

## I

For me the clue emerged in the African meeting. Here "proper" theologians wrestled with the pentecostal question. How do you deal with the present reality of the resurrected Christ in a fluid, revolutionary, and culturally pluralistic situation? How do you play the theological language game in that kind of a public arena?

Some would play it straight by old and traditional rules once evolved in another culture. Some echoed this kind of imperious traditionalism, even at Makerere. But sharp African critics discerned the spirit at work in this kind of dialogue and rejected it.

Some were tempted by the "success" of pentecostalism. Any kind of movement in the name of Jesus, even *glossalalia* and jibberish, was seen as a renewal of life with promise. But critical Africans wanted to know in what sense such movement of the spirit contributed to the public good—to life together. For them the movement of the spirit has to make some christological sense. Word and spirit belonged together. Whether the pentecostal movement augured promise or danger was an open question. That many Africans were deeply moved could not be denied, but to what end was not yet clear.

Between these extremes the African theologian now had to do his work. He could not simply echo the "pure" lan-

guage of the schools of Europe and America, nor regard as responsible the unintelligible tongues of enthusiastic pentecostalists.

What the African theologian tried faithfully to do was what the early disciples did when the power of the resurrected Christ was manifest. They did not cling to the pure language of their Christian heritage learned in European schools, but recognized the *diaspora* of God's children and began to speak in as many tongues as possible—"as the spirit gave them utterance." Were they moved by the mind of that same spirit which was in Christ "who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men" (Philippians 2:6-7)? Did they not clearly recognize that proper theological dialogue receives its propriety not from the superior power of the culture in which it originates but from the clear recognition that every language can become the bearer of the reality of the resurrected Christ? The word of God seeks to manifest its presence in every culture and every tongue. Such freedom in translation, such liberation, is the evidence of the spirit of Christ at work in theological dialogue.

## II

It was possible here to address anew basic questions related to the doctrine of the Trinity and Christology with appreciation for the symbolic power implicit in them. Such doctrines creatively dealt with and developed in the early centuries of Christianity were opened for discussion in terms of African cultural background and conceptual frame-

work. The assumption that certain language and conceptual tools had been adequately supplied by the classical tradition was seriously questioned. The essentially radical nature of the theological task was all but self-evident. There was no lack of appreciation for the classical tradition, but there was also clear recognition that their spirits could not simply rest in that linguistic and conceptual cradle.

The necessary openness in hermeneutical approach became most evident for me in a discussion on Old Testament Theology and the specific issue of tribalism and social structure. Here neither western sociological analysis nor exegetical presuppositions proved adequate in themselves to perform the theological task before the participants. New ice had to be broken. This required more than merely a refinement of tools for the task.

(The kinds of considerations involved in the difficult task of cultural translation of the faith which characterized this conference are illustrated in an introductory way in John Mbiti's book, *New Testament Eschatology In An African Background*, Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.)

Over a decade ago Abraham Heschel wrote, "One of the major symptoms of the general crisis existent in our world today is our lack of sensitivity to words. We use words as tools. We forget that words are a repository of the spirit. The tragedy of our times is that the vessels of the spirit are broken. We cannot approach the spirit unless we repair the vessels." (Abraham J. Heschel, *Prayer and Theological Discipline*, *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, Vol. XIV, No. 4, May 1959, p. 7.)

### III

I believe I saw evidence of the gradual rediscovery that "words are a repository of the spirit" in all three theological conferences, but particularly the one in Africa. A legitimate part of their criticism of their European theological heritage was that it tended to use "words as tools," and in too many instances as tools for manipulation.

Perhaps a broadening of ecumenical dialogue across cultural lines will lead us to a rediscovery of the true pentecostal experience in which we will be spared from the use of theological dialogue as a manipulative tool on the one hand or senseless jibberish on the other. If a renewed christological focus in transcultural setting can lead us to the wedding of word and spirit, then theology may yet serve communion.

This will involve much more than the technical and analytical study of hermeneutical questions. Those academic pursuits will have to accompany and follow after the *koiné* language games of the community of faith as it faces new cultural frontiers. If any suppose that they should control that game, or provide proper theological tools *in advance*, they may find themselves using words as tools in a sense quite foreign to pentecost and to the life of the church.

If the necessity of the African Church can be seen as part of our necessity then the common quest for the language of the spirit in many tongues may introduce us to a kind of freedom and diversity in theological dialogue which will add daily to the conversation those "who are being saved."

Such theologizing which engages in common speech for the freeing of the spirit may sometimes get out of hand.



It would not be the first time "seminarians" have been accused of drinking too much! But such theologizing may have the advantage that the common people will not miss the point of the present reality of the resurrected Christ. This kind of dialogue is precisely the kind of

"irregular theology" of which Karl Barth once spoke, and which will always need to have a certain priority over the more proper language of the schools. Schools can learn from it. The Church was born at pentecost. Theological schools came later.

# Who Is the Seminarian?

by HUGH T. KERR

*Warfield Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary and a Guggenheim Fellow in 1960, Dr. Kerr is an alumnus of Princeton University, Western Seminary, and did graduate study at the University of Edinburgh (Ph.D.) and the University of Tübingen, Germany. The author of six books, including *Mystery and Meaning* (Ryerson, 1958), he has been editor of *Theology Today* since 1952. During a sabbatical year, 1969-70, Professor Kerr made a study of teaching methodology at the graduate-professional level, with special attention to theological education and the teaching of religion in schools, colleges, and universities. This paper was read at a Faculty Seminar, November 9, 1972.*

THIS is a report prepared by a Faculty member of the Seminary, addressed to other Faculty members and administrative staff. It tries to relate some statistical data about our present student body with the perennial Faculty concern regarding curricular revision and better methods of teaching.

Many of the suggestions made in this report are not developed in any fullness, and often appear merely as questions. Distributed in advance of a scheduled Faculty Seminar, the report was meant as a "position paper" for group discussion. The Editor of *THE BULLETIN* has requested this somewhat shortened version, thinking it may be of wider interest to many alumni and friends of the Seminary.

The *thesis* of what follows in this report, which asks more questions than it gives answers, may be epitomized in the old aphorism of the red-brick schoolhouse teacher. "To teach arithmetic to John and Mary," the teacher observed, "you must not only know arithmetic; you must also know John and Mary."

## I. *Where Does the Seminarian Come From?*

(1) *Geographically*: Our students come mostly (1971-72) from the Eastern Seaboard and the eastern Central States (436), with the West and the western Central States accounting for about one-fifth of the total (105). The biggest sending states are N.J. (123), Pa. (78), N.Y. (55), Calif. (44), Texas (25). There are *no* students from Maine, N.H., Ver., S. Dak., N. Mex., Utah, Mont., Idaho, Alaska. We do not know, but could find out, how many come from rural, suburban, and metropolitan areas. A guess would be that the smallest group come from the largest cities.

(2) *Academically*: The most remarkable feature about the list of colleges and universities (1971-72) from which seminarians come is its diversity. The student body for 1971-72 came from 326 colleges, universities, and other kinds of institutions. Graduates from universities numbered 147; from colleges, 168. There were 200 colleges and universities sending a single student,

with 20 colleges and universities sending 5 or more (Rutgers 12, Grove City 10, Westminster, Pa., 10, etc.).

This astonishing variety makes recruitment and admissions, based on a predetermined standard of academic achievement, extremely relative and arbitrary. The Admissions Committee tries to operate with cut-off figures for academic standing, but almost always these items must be interrelated with other factors, such as recommendations, various tests, and autobiographical statements.

In the present mix of colleges and universities from which our students come to us, we are obviously *not* dealing with a homogeneous academic constituency. This clearly makes for difficulties not only in recruitment and admissions but for our teaching and curriculum. It may also account for some of the confusions, frustrations, and hostilities which students themselves experience when they come in contact on our campus with students from very different backgrounds.

As educators have often noted, it is relatively easy to teach and to prepare curriculum for highly academically-competitive students, such as at Harvard University, Princeton, Amherst, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Reed, or Vassar. But where the campus, as at the Seminary, has vast differences in both academic and cultural background, standardized courses and teaching methods that presume student uniformity are simply out of touch with reality.

Our situation in many ways is analogous to the current controversial "open admissions" policy of many city colleges and universities. But while "open admissions" is being widely debated on

educational grounds, as directly affecting teaching and curriculum, we have never seriously considered the educational effect of our diversified student background. Doctorate-trained faculty are tempted to teach subjects rather than students, and to the extent that this is true, the diversity of student background in any classroom is simply ignored as irrelevant.

(3) *Miscellaneous*: At the present time, the student enrollment numbers 625, with 32 black students, 76 women, and 90 kinds of denominations (45 among the three undergraduate classes). The shift over the past ten years from a predominantly Presbyterian constituency to the present multi-denominational mix is impressive. One of the biggest changes, denominationally, in very recent years is the large increase in Roman Catholic students at all levels.

According to the financial statement handed out by William E. Lawder, Treasurer of the Seminary, less than 10% of our annual operating budget comes from the Central Receiving Agency (CRA) of the United Presbyterian Church (UPUSA).

In the present Junior Class, there are 119 M.Div. candidates; of these, 63 are UPUSA students. We do not receive money from other denominations, such as Methodist, Episcopal, Lutheran, etc. And according to Richard S. Armstrong, Vice President for Development, the cost of educating a student at the Seminary, *beyond* what the student pays or receives in scholarships, is \$930 per year.

This "church-financing," whether from the CRA or from local congregations, raises a question about the ethical propriety of using such funds for edu-

cating students who openly declare they have no interest in church vocations.

## II. *Why Do Students Come to Seminary?*

(1) *Recruitment and Admissions:* We may imagine that our student body reflects our recruitment and admissions policies, and there is some truth in that. We go after the colleges and universities which offer the best prospects. We follow up on leads from alumni, friends, and students now enrolled. We invite likely seminarians to the campus. We carry on voluminous correspondence.

But there is another angle here. Do we get what we deserve, or is what we get what is available? If some think the academic level of our incoming students is not high enough, or that there are too many conservatives, or pietists, or gadflies stinging the establishment, or Jesus people, or introverts trying to get their heads together—the reason may be that this is the largest pool of prospective seminarians from which *any* seminary can draw.

It may be that there is not now, and never has been (except when we were in seminary), a large pool of highly qualified students, eager and willing to plunge into advanced study, enthusiastic about the mission of the church in the world, grounded in the liberal arts tradition, well-versed in the Scriptures, committed to the faith, adjusted and emotionally healthy, friendly and congenial with all kinds of students.

If we want different kinds of students from what we have, where are they to be found, and how would we attract them? Maybe we need to explore this, but in the meantime maybe we should be grateful that we have any students

at all these days. That they measure up to our standards of academic excellence is not as important as that we help them to attain their own maximum theological and educational level.

(2) *The "little adult":* James E. Dittes of Yale has sketched a profile of the professional religious person, including the seminarian, and his picture is recognizable, if also ambiguous.

"The key to the personality characteristics of a person who chooses to enter a religious vocation lies in a strong identification with adult values and the adult role, labelled here, playing the 'little adult.' . . . As a young boy, he is the one who is always good for the babysitter and not unruly in school . . . the 'responsible' boy whose friends, insofar as he has any, are approved by his parents. . . . He is far more likely to participate in and to lead adult-sponsored and adult-sanctioned groups (church youth groups, school paper, debating team, student government) than he is to be involved in strictly peer groups. . . . Adults welcome him as class monitor, crossing guard, usher, treasurer, editor. . . .

"His role with peers is a specialized and restricted one and minimizes intimate relationships. . . . He may become peculiarly self-conscious, introspective, and shy. . . . Personal relationships proceed by calculation and resolve. . . . He becomes a subject of a universe of laws and rules and careful control, rather than a citizen experiencing freedom and faith, for he carries a mistrust of future intimacies, a wariness of investing oneself in personal relationships. . . .

"To the adolescent boy, the clergy role (preaching, conducting worship,



pastoral counselling) appears a natural continuation of the little adult role. . . . The ministry is the best opportunity open to a boy to do what he does best, be the spokesman and exemplar for adult values of responsibility, achievement, 'sharing with others,' and control of impulses." (Digested from the lengthy article by James E. Dittes, "Psychological Characteristics of Religious Professionals," being Chap. 11 in *Research on Religious Development*, ed. by Merton P. Strommen, Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1971; the paraphrase is taken from pp. 429-434. Dittes anticipated this chauvinist portrait in his earlier book, *Minister on the Spot*, 1970, pp. 130-138).

If the "little adult" construct is anywhere near target, then this raises all kinds of questions about teaching, curriculum, fieldwork, and placement. Most of us probably wouldn't know whether this sketch is accurate or not since our contacts with students are mostly restricted to academic and incidental campus contexts. In many ways these are for seminarians themselves simply the most structured but perhaps the least significant influences in their lives. What they read (apart from assignments), what music they listen to, what films and TV they watch, who their friends are, what they do with their leisure and solitude, what their contacts are with home and family, what their physical and emotional needs are—these and a hundred other factors help fill out the profile sketch of the seminarian in our midst.

(3) *What Students Expect of Seminary*: One of the best clues to what seminarians are like is their autobio-

graphical statements in their admissions applications. The following excerpts are taken from dossiers of the present *Junior Class*:

"God's love is now within me rather than far away. . . . My life has become exciting and full of joy by seeking and following God's will for my life. . . . I am dependent on him to reveal what my ministry will be. . . . The variety of the student-body and the large foreign student population at PTS have been major factors in my choice [of seminary]."

"I would hope to learn more of the ability of the church in meeting the needs of the people and how Christ can be presented to all ages, colors, and creeds . . . after visiting three other seminaries . . . I have come to the conclusion that PTS not only has the most appropriate faculty but also the most appropriate situation for a concentrated ministry in the 20th century . . . everytime you run into a 'Princeton man,' this individual has something good to say about the Seminary."

"My love for Christ and my desire to serve him . . . are the main strengths I bring into my theological study . . . [and] my desire to be with, relate, and work with all types of people. . . . PTS seems to offer the best combination of a new, progressive curriculum based upon a solid traditional background."

Personal religious experience, sometimes of the pietistic kind, figures frequently in such statements. But we must distinguish between the "piousness" of a former age and the contemporary un-

embarrassed openness, which so many young people today share, about articulated religious experiences. There appears to be less private search-for-identity in this year's applications and more seriousness of vocational purpose. There is no evidence in these citations of dissident or disruptive social attitudes, and the mood seems very much to the right of center.

The Faculty gets high marks, as does the curriculum; and our geographical location, which not so long ago seemed a drawback, now counts on our behalf. The moral of this observation: what many of us take to be our weaknesses may be regarded by our students as strengths.

### III. *What Happens at Graduation?*

One way to gauge the effectiveness of our educational program is to see what happens to seminarians five, ten, fifteen, or twenty-five years after graduation. We do not have much recent information on alumni critique of seminary education, and we do not know, for example, whether high academic achievement (or low) has anything to do with career achievement, professional competence, or ministerial effectiveness. Studies in other areas of higher education hint that there is little correlation between grades and careers.

What we do have is extensive data on the placement of seniors, and others, at the time of and shortly after graduation. Here we can rely on the annual reports of Arthur M. Byers, Jr., Secretary of the Seminary.

(1) *Graduates of 1972*: Two significant features in the 1972 Report are: (a) the fact that  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the graduates were not known to be placed 3 months after graduation, and (b) the decline in

numbers over previous years of those placed in pastoral or congregational positions. The first item (33 graduates, out of 101, unplaced by Aug. 28, 1972) may be interpreted in several ways, but compared with 1971, the number has doubled.

Of more direct educational import is the decline in the number of seminarians going into pastoral or congregational positions. For 1972, 44.8% of graduates were placed in pastoral-type posts, with the remainder either in other kinds of positions or not yet placed. (In 1971, 56.5% were in pastoral-congregational jobs.) As Arthur Byers notes: "There is a larger number of seniors this year who seem indifferent to a church vocation, and many have made no effort to work with me to seek a call. It reflects something about our current times."

What the trend, if it is a trend, reflects is not clear. All jobs are scarce these days, churches are feeling the pinch of tightening budgets, some students who first try non-pastoral careers later enter church-related ministries, those engaged in graduate study, internships, and clinical pastoral education, as well as some who are in teaching and social work, should perhaps be counted as involved in "ministry."

(2) *Non-Interest in the Pastorate*: If there is a trend away from church vocations, this is an issue of crucial importance for teaching and curriculum, as well as for recruitment, admissions, and placement. Do students come expecting to assume a pastoral ministry and then, in mid-course, decide against it? If so, why so? Is such a decision related to our teaching, courses, or campus life? Do some come to seminary with no intention of going into a church-related vo-

cation? Should we screen out such applications? How many non-pastoral students should we admit, or should we even ask such a question?

Is it possible that the non-pastorate student belongs to what Glock and Stark call "the new breed," who are more liberal, tolerant, and more socially oriented than the majority? They are also the most likely to receive little support, become disillusioned and discouraged, and sooner or later abandon the church altogether. (Charles Y. Glock, Rodney Stark, *et al.*, *Wayward Shepherds: Prejudice and the Protestant Clergy*, 1971; cf. also Gerald J. Jud, *et al.*, *Ex-Pastors: Why Men Leave the Parish Ministry*, 1970).

(3) *A Two-Track Curriculum*: If non-church vocations continue to be live options for a considerable segment of seminarians, and if the local church continues retrenchment, should we consider retooling our whole educational philosophy and program to take this trend into account?

If we develop and encourage non-church vocations in the area of social work, counselling, and other "miscellaneous categories," will we be able to place such seminarians? Can present members of the Faculty adjust their teaching and courses to qualify for such programs?

Even if we did decide to take this non-pastoral curricular route, wouldn't we fly in the face of mounting evidence that such procedures are doomed to failure? The Kelley report on the growth of the conservative tradition and such news as the recent *Time* report on Union Theological Seminary scarcely encourage educational programs that depart significantly from the center of traditional theological educa-

tion, much as some of us might like it otherwise. We would agree perhaps that the way to meet this challenge is not to abandon our own integrity to join forces with the new reactionary movement; but neither is it to accelerate even more so the out-on-a-limb, church-detached trend. (Dean M. Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing*, 1972; "The State of Union," *Time*, Oct. 9, 1972), p. 84.)

It may be, of course, that this non-church mood has peaked, and that the present Junior Class represents a turn in the road. It could also mean that the conservative trend noted by Kelley, which has always found a comfortable home in our midst, is now increasing as it is everywhere and beginning to dominate. Either way, the emerging big problem for us will be to train and place seminarians for an American church situation that appears to be undergoing radical curtailment of previously expansionary goals. Added to this will be the challenge to do something very special for our increasing numbers of black students and women seminarians. It could be argued, given these consuming responsibilities, that while a big seminary like Princeton can afford a few lookers-on, this is not its main reason for being.

#### IV. *Who Are the Returning Seminarians?*

We stand to learn something about our educational programs and about ourselves from listening to those who return to the campus for further study, graduate work, continuing education, summer programs, and for the new D.Min. degree. Unfortunately, we have very little data on returning seminarians, and what we have is mostly in the

form of impressions and casual conversations.

(1) *Continuing Education Feedback:*

The continuing education movement has attained some sort of maturity, and there is a library of material on the relation between seminary education and on-the-spot ministry. Bennett J. Sims, former Director of Continuing Education at the Virginia (Episcopal) Theological Seminary, and now Bishop of Atlanta (who took his first year, 1949, at Princeton Seminary), has written: "Men enter the ministry today, and remain or depart, on grounds of self-fulfillment much more than for reasons of heroic self-losing. . . . The chief arena of conflict is almost always inside the minister himself." (*Pastoral Psychology*, March, 1971.)

This ministerial search for self is not to be confused with the student search for identity. The latter is self-directed; the former is career-directed. The minister's search is not in the realm of "privatism" but in the interests of applying himself or herself creatively in a ministering situation.

Studies in "the helping professions" at the University of Florida, in Gainesville, imply that the best "helpers" are those who have positive attitudes about themselves and acceptance attitudes about others. (Arthur W. Combs, *et al.*, *Florida Studies in the Helping Professions*, 1969; cf. Donald L. Avila, *et al.*, *The Helping Relationship Sourcebook*, 1971.)

Here again, the point is not for us to argue about the details but to consider how the minister's self-search and self-image, *in relation to ministry*, may affect our teaching and curriculum in theological education. If the development of the minister's role as a pro-

fessional-helping-person is of concern for our graduates, we need to ask ourselves how our educational program is related to this. A careful reading of the *Seminary Catalogue* would hardly persuade a prospective candidate that we do much along this line at the undergraduate level.

(2) *The D.Min. Program:* It is too early to evaluate this degree, but we can expect in due course to get some feedback from the new candidates. We do have autobiographical statements of the applicants admitted for 1972-73, of which the following can be taken as typical:

"It is my expectation that the D. Min. program can help me improve my capabilities as a generalist in ministry and sharpen my theological reflection. . . . I would plan to develop an evangelistic sensitivity within the congregation with a view to establishing a program designed to enlist the time, talents, and efforts of persons willing to participate in such a venture."

"Values I would expect to gain through participation in the D.Min. program: improved morale . . . growth in ministerial skills . . . greater sensitivity . . . confidence in theologizing. . . . Through selected readings and mutual reflection, [I would] explore the theological and ethical aspects, the caring and restorative aspects, the communicative and educative aspects, and the organizational and administrative aspects of the mission of the . . . Church."

"I expect to gain new insights into the concept of ministry by engaging in this course of study which will sharp-



en my skills for the pastoral ministry and assist me in learning how to evaluate my ministry and that of those associated with me and the staff here at ..... Church."

It remains to be seen how the new D.Min. degree program will develop, whether and how it will fulfill the candidates' expectations, and in what ways it will influence and be influenced by the undergraduate academic program. So far there has been little if any contact between the D.Min. candidates and other Seminary students. And it is no secret that the new program has been started with less than enthusiastic faculty support, not only at Princeton but in other seminaries as well.

### *Summary*

To repeat the thesis of this report: most of us, Faculty and Staff, do not know very much about our students,

their backgrounds, or their outside-of-class lives; if we did know more about our students, this would suggest substantial modifications in our teaching methods and our curriculum programs. Discussion among faculty members of new teaching methods *without considering the students themselves* is a waste of time.

To take this proposal seriously would not necessarily imply taking less seriously standards of quality academic work, nor would it hand over to the students the construction of curriculum or the conduct of classes.

As with the current "open admissions" policy in many metropolitan colleges and universities, the intent is not to reduce standards of higher education or devise a hierarchy of academic tracks, but to take the student's background into account in the whole educational enterprise.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Theological Dynamics*, by Seward Hiltner. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1972. Pp. 224. \$5.75.

For some years now Seward Hiltner has had a double role: as professor of theology and personality at Princeton Theological Seminary and as consultant at the Menninger School of Psychiatry. Through the years, in case conferences and other meetings at the latter School, he found he could suggest contributions from theology to the understanding of mental health problems and, conversely, considerations of mental health could exercise a critique upon theological concepts. In 1967 he gave a series of lectures at Menninger for his colleagues and others on the understanding of a number of theological doctrines in the light of the dynamics of personal life and personal relationships. He was encouraged by the response to enlarge the discussion into a book.

The book is most provocative and helpful when it holds to this original structure, which is in Chapters 1-4, 6 and 7. The criticism of a theologian friend that the manuscript neglected the social and institutional aspects of the human situation led to additions such as the chapter on "Church and Community," which then falls outside the main thrust of the argument. Hiltner's purpose is to see what light theological doctrines and personal dynamics can throw on each other, a highly interesting project. The latter rather than the former is his area of greater expertise and when he attempts to develop doctrines of the church and the word of God, his constructions are not particularly impressive.

It would be unfair to assess this book as a volume on Christian doctrine. It does not pretend to be a comprehensive statement of the Christian faith or a thorough discussion of selected doctrines. Rather, it is a somewhat personal statement of what Hiltner has learned as he has let his two areas of interest interpenetrate each other. He knows his way around among the theologians, ancient and modern, and he confesses that the years have given him an increasing respect for the great central doctrines of the Christian faith, but the focal point of his interest through the

years has been in personal dynamics rather than in theology and this shows at times in the balance of elements in the discussion. However, as the book unfolds, one is impressed by the extent to which the theology falls into a basically biblical and reformed pattern. One glimpses here and there signs of a pilgrimage: a rather austere Presbyterian background that needed reinterpretation of its doctrines, a sojourn in Chicago liberalism that has left insights that are not to be lost, an exploration of traditional doctrines which were once brushed aside as antiquated but are now found to be intensely relevant to the problems of modern man. At one point Hiltner confesses that until recently the concept "word of God" was repugnant to him, but now he finds it sufficiently meaningful to center one of his chapters on it.

The chapters frequently leave one wishing the author had carried the discussion farther. For instance, the title of Chapter 1, "Freedom and Destiny," makes one anticipate more than a page on destiny; and when in Chapter 2, he makes such statements concerning grace as that "God is deeply immersed in his creation," we recognize that destiny as an expression of God's grace could have been brought into a more illuminating relation with freedom. In Chapter 3, on "Providence and Trust," the modern acute dilemma about providence does not come out into the open because of a failure to refer to the collapse and abandonment of the concept of God as *deus ex machina*. No doctrine of providence can be credible that does not take account of the "weakness of God" manifest in the cross, yet the cross receives little attention here or elsewhere. But we are grateful to have it brought out so forcefully that man's nature is distorted when he finds nothing meaningful or trustworthy in the impact of the world upon his life.

John Oman (p. 205) is described as "a competent scholar with an Anglican perspective on grace," rather than as the eminent English Presbyterian theologian. It is not clear what is Anglican rather than Reformed in his conception of grace. Also, in Chapter 6, on the word of God, Barth is alleged to narrow the channel of communi-

cation for the word of God to the words of preaching. The early pages of his *Dogmatics* make clear that the word is communicated through the totality of the Christian community's existence and may actually find expression through other than Christian channels. But it comes to its sharpest focus and expression in Christian preaching and there takes a form that makes it most accessible to critical theological examination.

JAMES D. SMART

Rosedale Presbyterian Church  
Toronto, Canada

*Change in the Church: A Source of Hope*, by Robert C. Worley. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1971. Pp. 127.

The book begins with a quotation from Jürgen Moltmann to the effect that Christian hope will lead our intolerably imperfect institutions away from their own imminent tendency toward stabilization and open them to that elasticity which is demanded by openness toward the future. How this is to be done is Worley's theme.

In the first four chapters it is suggested that corporate leadership replace rugged individualism, new understanding of organizations be used to make Christian theology operative in a society of large institutions, primary attention be paid to developing a climate of trust, openness, and reconciliation, and the ethical pluralism of the early Church be adopted in an effort to bring under the sovereignty of Christ both individuals and the society which forms them.

A picture of the Church emerges in chapters five through seven. It should be a continuation of the life of Christ, an incarnation of the Christian message. The gospel, like any system of values, must take institutional form if it is to have maximum effect. There is no room in our kind of world, either theologically or practically, for the idea that if the Church would just die, a new, free, appropriate form of Christianity would emerge, namely, a non-institutional form. The Pauline conception of the body of Christ suggests that Christians do not act in the world as individuals but as members of the body. It also implies that messages may go from the

head to any part of the body, so that every member should be heard when decisions are made. This insight is related to current awareness among organization theorists of the importance of shared power. The Church may be understood as a system of relationships, with (1) a structure which designates areas of responsibility and accountability; (2) processes of communication and decisionmaking which express values, interests, and theological commitments; and (3) content which is the theological viewpoint that shapes the structures and processes. Power is distributed by structure but appears most obviously in the processes. One-sided, it is alienating; shared, it establishes a context for reconciliation and the hope which inspires vigorous motivation. Power is expandable: to share it is not to decrease, but enlarge it, since participation in decision-making leads to more willingness for action and increases the total energy available. Thus, the democratic church has the most strength available for mission.

The last two chapters call for a dramatic shift in the primary focus of ministry from traditional activities to the development of the Church as an organization so it can more effectively function as the body of Christ in the world. Along with this, a change in the style of leadership is required: since no person now has access to all the relevant data for decision-making and everyone knows this and is alienated by power-plays, one must learn to trust people and depend on a process no one can control. Ministers and laymen are urged to be change-agents who help groups clarify goals and priorities, call attention to needed changes, identify persons with readiness and capacities, and develop appropriate structures and processes.

In the hands of the ministers and laymen for whom it is designed this persuasive little book should inspire new attitudes toward organizational activity and a crucial willingness to share power. The author's numerous consulting assignments in congregations and judicatories enabled him to test his theories and speak with assurance. These experiences may also have something to do with the fact that his style is "cool" and in the last two chapters, at least, would come across better in a consulting relationship than in print. Those moved to initiate change will find that they need more help than they have received. This may, of course, have been in-

tentional, since evidence is mounting that the change process often requires outside help, but this point could have been made explicit.

Worley attempts to bring some aspects of organization theory into dialogue with theology. He finds useful relationships between Paul's image of the body of Christ and the system model as applied to the Church. He proposes the reconciliation motif as a context for his central affirmations about shared power, though he goes too far in the dictum that "true reconciliation occurs only between equals," a statement that would rule out reconciliation with God! There is substance here, however, for even the divine act of reconciliation required the self-emptying of himself by the Lord of all. The incarnational model of the Church is offered, with help from current Roman Catholic writers, as a ground for the assumption of the book that the Spirit of God shapes the character of the Church and increases its impact through organizational processes and the persons who administer them.

One may agree with the author that for too long theological seminaries ignored the organizational structures of the Church in their preparation of ministers, but it is not quite true that no efforts are now being made to educate ministers for effective functioning in church organizations. Several Methodist schools are working at this, and Princeton Seminary, at least, offers a wide variety of courses in this field during the year and in the summer school, as well as a substantial number of continuing education seminars and workshops. However, theologically informed literature about organizational life is still scarce and we welcome this volume.

ARTHUR M. ADAMS

*An Introduction to Contemporary Preaching*, by J. Daniel Baumann. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1972. Pp. 302. \$6.95.

Every teacher of preaching entertains a vision of the model textbook in his field. Not a few have attempted to make this image a reality. Some of these turned out to be hardy perennials and have made certain names to become household words in sermonic craftsmanship: Brooks, Broadus, Blackwood, Davis,

Sangster, and others. This latest volume, by Professor Baumann of Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, is one of the few major efforts in the area of preaching theory since Professor Davis gave us his definitive work, *Design for Preaching*, in 1958.

The approach in this textbook is in keeping with the new movements of our times. The material is divided (like Gaul and Presbyterian sermons) into three parts: Communication, Biblical Truth, and Behavioral Change. Each section indicates that Professor Baumann has done his homework well. Under Communication he recognizes the new era created by mass media and the apostles of change such as McLuhan, Howe, Hayakawa, and others. However, the locus of his discussion is the preacher as a person and his relationship with his hearers and to his message and its intention. Part II, on "Preaching the Bible" is a very thorough handling of the basic modes best fitted for proper exposition of the scriptures. Much of this section is familiar ground to homiletics, yet Baumann's up-to-date reading supplies a measure of freshness that even the most discriminative among us can appreciate. Part III, on "Behavioral Change," is an original discussion of preaching as a means "toward life-style changes." As an agent of such change, preaching is supported by strong arguments and evidences from diverse fields, but particularly by the results of the "innovation and creativity" of the Holy Spirit whose role in all Christian witness is indispensable.

Literature on the art of preaching has diminished from the flood-tide of yesterday to the barest trickle today. Maybe this is a good thing. Discriminative publishers, however, will assure us of sufficient resources if the quality of their homiletical monographs matches Professor Baumann's guidelines on how both sermon and preacher are made.

DONALD MACLEOD

*20 Centuries of Great Preaching: An Encyclopedia of Preaching*, ed. by Clyde E. Fant, Jr. and William M. Pinson, Jr. Word Books, Inc., Waco, Texas, 1971. 13 vols. \$179.95.

Few anthologies of sermons have been compiled in the Christian era and those we



have been published only during the past one hundred years. Research students have depended mainly upon *History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence*, by H. C. Fish (Dodd, Mead, 1877), *The World's Great Sermons*, by G. K. Kleiser (Funk & Wagnalls, 1908), *Master Sermons of the 19th Century*, by G. G. Atkins (Willett, Clark, 1940) and *The World's Great Sermons*, by S. E. Frost (Halcyon, 1943). There have been many volumes of the collected works of individual preachers—Edwards, Brooks, Parker, Beecher, Morgan, Fosdick, and others—but there has been a strange lack of compilations of sermonic literature embracing a protracted span of centuries of Christian witness and testimony. For this reason, both preachers and teachers of preachers will welcome this most recent encyclopedia which features a broad selection of sermons and considerable research into biographical detail.

The editors, who serve on the faculty of Southwestern Baptist Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, do not follow the usual method of choosing sermons according to abstract rhetorical criteria, but approach their task in this way: "Great preaching is relevant preaching. That is not a presupposition with which this work was begun, but a conclusion to which it came. After studying the lives of hundreds of preachers and reading countless sermons, we concluded that the preachers who made the greatest impact upon the world were men who spoke to the issues and needs of their day" (I, p.v.). The format and strategy they adopted are as follows: "The chapter on each preacher includes a portrait, a brief chronology of the events of his life, a concise biography relating the man to his times, an analysis of his preaching, a sample of his sermons, and a selected bibliography of further resources."

This 13-volume set provides one volume which has six comprehensive indexes for purposes of cross-reference; photographs or portraits of most of the preachers; many sermons not hitherto available; an index to more than 10,000 illustrations from the sermons and lives of the preachers; and a homiletical index as a guide to every aspect of the theory of sermonic preparation.

It is trite to add that these editors have put us all tremendously in their debt. Nevertheless it is true we have received from their labors a magnificent boon and our teaching is

bound to be the better for it. No other author or editor has provided for us so rich and representative a collection. It is only human for us, however, to look for certain names that are not here and to wonder about some that are. But we come away even from a hymn book with a similar feeling. There are praises to God in poetry that are not named in every anthology and yet their reality is not permanently dimmed. So with the pulpit, no anthology can encompass all who have made or will bear a witness in the Christian pulpit. But if anyone has borne a witness that has touched us enough to make it to be remembered, that voice has contributed something lasting among the intangibilities of the Kingdom.

DONALD MACLEOD

*The New World Idea Index to the Holy Bible*, ed. by Harvey K. Griffith. World Publishing, New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 907. \$14.95.

Topical concordances of scripture have not been numerous; in fact, with the exception of Nave's and Zondervan's, there has been no substantial encyclopedia of this sort compiled. This new "idea index" is the fruit of seventeen years of research and presents a method and mechanism that are both more comprehensive and useful than previous compendiums. The editor, Harvey K. Griffith, who is serving presently as consultant on religious studies for Casyndekan, Inc., Colorado Springs, Colorado, was assisted by Edward Everding of the faculty of Iliff School of Theology, Denver, and Patrick O'Donnell of the faculty of St. Thomas Seminary, also of Denver. This editorial group began their assignment by naming and classifying ideas instead of cataloguing words as one would for a concordance. Then they moved on to idea relationships and the classification and indexing of groupings according to concept sets. Over 1,000 terms were compiled and with their related combinations of ideas the index lists some 56,000 notations and references. Preachers will find in this volume not only a ready guide to the places where ideas are discussed in scripture, but will see new avenues of thought being opened up through the process of concept blocks and combinations.

DONALD MACLEOD

*A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, ed. by J. G. Davies. Macmillan Co., New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 385. \$9.95.

It is difficult to give an initial evaluation of a volume of this kind. Not only does the fact of some sixty contributors defeat the exercise of any one critical apparatus, but like any handy reference compilation, one has to live with it for a season in order to assess its worth fairly. The editor, J. G. Davies, professor of theology at the University of Birmingham, has already demonstrated his scholarly breadth and versatility in such volumes as *The Early Christian Church* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965), *Worship and Mission* (Association, 1967), and *Holy Week: A Short History* (John Knox, 1963).

This volume is an ambitious enterprise, a compilation of 361 articles by leading liturgical scholars and writers from many denominational backgrounds and religious persuasions. In one sense it is a dictionary, a collection in alphabetical order of definitions of liturgical customs, objects, and terms. In another sense it is a sourcebook of considerable dimensions with articles of some length on the acts of worship, sacraments and ordinances of most major denominations and traditions. This material is accompanied by helpful diagrams, photographs, and illustrations from both classical and contemporary sources. Some of the material is borrowed directly from authoritative writings already widely recognized in the liturgical field; much, however, is new material which has been up-dated in view of the publication of many recent service books and contemporary liturgies. With such names as Horton Davies, T. S. Garrett, Alan A. McArthur, W. D. Maxwell, Alan Richardson, Stephen Winward among the contributors, the quality of this reference book is almost automatically guaranteed.

The title, incidentally, is unfortunate, even after Professor Davies' reasons for choosing it. A more happy choice would have been simply *A Liturgical Dictionary*, which would not have perpetuated the artificial distinction between liturgy and worship.

Altogether, however, this is a useful compendium and worth the price many times over.

DONALD MACLEOD

*Ask Me to Dance*, by Bruce Larson. Word Books, Waco, Texas, 1972. Pp. 126. \$3.95.

Recently Bruce Larson resigned from the presidency of Faith at Work in order to spend an extended sabbatical leave in writing and study. Since his graduation from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1952, Mr. Larson has exercised his ministry in several dimensions—as a writer, preacher, counselor, and administrator. He has excelled in every one of these and the marvel is that he has done all of them simultaneously. He has been a key organizer in countless Faith at Work conferences, served as leader and counselor in bringing them to success, has continued a steady preaching schedule, and has written five books with over 700,000 copies now in print. Moreover, the range of his own reading allows him to write from an informed mind which in the course of a few pages will illustrate from an amalgam of viewpoints from Fénelon, Tillich, Tournier, Kaj Munk, Hugo, G. B. Shaw, and St. Francis de Sales.

The title of this latest volume does not imply that Mr. Larson has joined the superficial "mods." It does mean that he is an open minded person who appropriates skillfully the best from the old and the new. The idea, he indicates, is suggested by the fact that "the church is full of people of faith asking us to teach them to dance. . . . The dance of joy becomes authentic posture for released people, living in wholeness with meaning" (pp. 103, 105). The author does not live a near-sighted existence. He sees the emergence of a new church and he is eager to alert Christians to the demands of the "next" beyond the "now." Conversion and commitment, he asserts, are basic necessities, but what about those further steps after one is "set free by God to be oneself"? The evangelical call "to give yourself to Christ" still has validity, but what does it entail *tomorrow*? To exercise the "priesthood of all believers" is an authentic notion but like so many of our timeworn concepts, it is either badly understood or equally badly neglected.

The author does not claim to have all the answers nor even the ultimate panacea. He does, however, tell us how as persons we can be more real and human and through openness move to wholeness akin to the abundant life. This role must be exercised in com-

munity, through a sensitive awareness of one another, and by accepting responsibility for healing and wholeness in others.

DONALD MACLEOD

*The Future Shape of Preaching*, by Thor Hall. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1971. Pp. xx + 140. \$3.50 (paper).

Thor Hall predicated the 1970 James Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, on the assumption that "the trouble with contemporary preaching is that it is out of touch with the realities of our intellectual situation; it is not growing to theological maturity the way students of theological methodology, hermeneutics, and religious language are" (p. 71). Thus Hall sets quite a task for himself by asserting that "our present situation calls for a homiletic of a vastly different kind" from that of the past (p. xvi).

The book is divided into two major sections: "The New Context of Preaching" and "Preaching in the New Context." The first section examines the immediacy of the media and the new ecclesiology, and then turns to the meaning of the message. Only in this latter portion does the book begin to move, for the earlier discussions are rehashes of recent books concerning communications and church renewal. In considering the meaning of the message, Hall analyzes theological, hermeneutical, and linguistic positions ontologically and epistemologically by means of a series of line charts, each of which contains eight compass points. Helpful as the diagrams may be, they suffer from the old difficulty of trying to draw pictures of the Trinity: Everything is too clear-cut and static to be honest or vital.

One of the serious problems of this book is that all positions except the author's are dismissed as if they had been perpetrated by theological nincompoops. The attempt to limit the future shape of preaching to only one position is unduly constrictive not only intellectually but also in terms of the catholicity of the Church. Strange as it may seem, through the centuries God has managed to get the gospel preached by all sorts and conditions of men—and probably will continue to do so.

The one position which is put forth as viable assumes that modern man is scientifically oriented through and through and will not tolerate anything metaphysical, prescientific, or non-rational. This is quite an assumption in light of the fact that a number of scientists from pure theoreticians to computer programmers hold seances and join covins to practice the occult arts. And it is an interesting position in view of the failure of the Enlightenment to obliterate Trinitarianism on similar grounds.

When Hall turns to the more practical matter of preaching in the new context, he gives us little idea as to how his theories might change our practices. Perhaps there ought to be a law that people who spin colorful threads of homiletical theory must, before they quit for the day, weave a few sermonic tapestries by means of which we might evaluate and appropriate the theories. While Hall is correct in suggesting that printed sermons are not really sermons at all because they have been removed from the oral-aural context, if a homiletic presented to us is of a vastly different kind, we need some help in concrete terms; and even a printed text should be able to illustrate some of the vast differences. But no sermons are included.

Early in the book, homiletical imperialism is thrown out of the window:

... revaluation of the central purpose of the ministerial office means the end of all imperialistic claims on behalf of the pulpit, while at the same time it marks the beginning of a new integration of the various aspects of ordained ministry around the gospel itself. The homiletician must learn to live with that, and I think he can. After all, the pulpit represents only one form for the communication of the gospel (p. 37).

The homiletician, then, does not have a leg to stand on if he wants to claim essentiality—or even centrality—for the activity of preaching (p. 38).

But despite Hall's insistence to the contrary, it is difficult to avoid the impression that imperialism sneaks in the back door near the end of the book:

Looking over the ministrations or offices or activities of ministry in the church . . . it



appears questionable, in fact, whether any other single medium of ministry is capable of facilitating such a full and representative encounter with the gospel as the ministry of preaching, rightly understood (p. 104).

Later, this tentative assertion becomes a bold statement: "No other single ministration of the church's ongoing confrontation with the gospel is so important to the church's life" (p. 110).

The most disturbing aspect of the book is not what it says, however, but the way in which it says it. There is a recurring undertone of disparagement of the church—its leaders and governing bodies, and of individuals—students, pastors, and particularly those who have criticized the author publicly or privately. More to the point, theological positions other than Hall's are dismissed with derogatory terms such as "useless" (revelational hermeneutic), "worthless" (common sense hermeneutic), and "obviously . . . suspect" (hermeneutic of divine-human encounter). As in a Western, the bad guys all wear black hats and can be categorically dismissed; the good guy has a monopoly on virtue. Even the reader is occasionally insulted with a phrase such as "let me remind you" (when the object of the mnemonic injunction is clearly shown in a chart on the pages previous and facing). At a number of points, the tone of the book makes the reader feel like answering the author with the sarcasm of exasperated Job: "No doubt wisdom will die with you."

The intention of the author is good; he is concerned with the state of preaching and wants us to wrestle with the meaning of the task. He is wise in suggesting that "sermons must grow out of and feed into the congregation's consciousness of the gospel" (p. 111). And all preachers would do well to heed Hall's advice that "they ought not to strive to make their sermons into elaborate and permanent objects of art" (p. 124). But the attempt to make preaching thoroughly respectable intellectually does not succeed. Once again, the defenders of preaching seem to do more damage than the critics. One wonders if we would not do well to accept the Pauline evaluation of preaching as foolishness, and then go and preach with faithfulness. Another word from the Apostle might also

commend itself to us: Whichever theological option we may choose from among eight (or eighty), and whatever the future shape of preaching may turn out to be, surely preachers, of all people, need to take more seriously the ancient wisdom that if we speak in tongues of men or of angels, but are without love, we are but sounding gongs or clanging cymbals.

LAURENCE H. STOOKEY

*The Integrity of Worship: Ecumenical and Pastoral Studies in Liturgical Theology*, by Paul Waitman Hoon. Abington Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1971. Pp. 363. \$8.50.

Until recently, American Protestants have been content to view worship as "the preliminaries" before the sermon. Consequently, we have written many books on how to do worship, but few on what worship is really all about. To understand worship theologically, one has had to turn to Protestant writers on the other side of the Atlantic, or to Roman Catholic authors. Of late, matters have improved, however; and nowhere is the change more evident than in Paul Hoon's work, *The Integrity of Worship*. As Hoon understands things, "all thought about worship and all statements about its nature must be subject to the meaning of Jesus Christ as the sovereign norm for their truth and validity. Christian worship by definition is Christological, and analysis of the meaning of worship likewise must be fundamentally Christological" (p. 77).

What this means in terms of the book itself is that we are given basic questions with which we must wrestle, not easy answers or prescriptions for shaping next Sunday morning's order of service. The pastor who is seeking a manual from which he can draw items to fill his bulletin will not find much help here. What he will discover instead is a perceptive analysis of worship which can, if he allows it, challenge his basic presuppositions and change his orientation toward the liturgical task.

In addressing himself to the current situation, for example, Hoon demands that innovators and experimenters must have a Christian rationale for what they do. He does



not oppose new forms of worship; indeed, he suggests some of his own. But he insists that God is always the center of worship and warns that the Reformers did not give us the freedom to worship as we please; rather, they were determined "that God be worshipped as he pleased to reveal himself in his Word" (p. 46). Hoon observes that "liturgy" is frequently turned into "lit-orgy" (whether by the old-time revivalists or the contemporary celebrationists) and cautions that "experience for the sake of experience replaces encounter with the Word and that worship is made into a kind of psychological gamesmanship" (p. 231). The danger is that such gamesmanship can degenerate into manipulation; we must recognize that in worship, as elsewhere, brainwashing is a demonic possibility. Worship which has integrity is "an experience in which all the meanings of man's life meet before God" (p. 161).

Paul Hoon, a United Methodist who holds the Henry Sloane Coffin Chair of Pastoral Theology at Union Seminary, New York, continually steers a resolute course between Scylla and Charybdis. He devotes a chapter to relevance and irrelevance in worship and finds good and bad points in both characteristics. In another essay he skillfully holds objectivity and subjectivity in creative tension. Believing that church renewal and liturgical renewal are intertwined, Hoon declares:

... worship is always to be shot through and through with the claim to love and to serve. . . . Let it be clear once and for all that the congregation can partake of the action of Christian worship only as they act ethically toward their fellowmen, and that they can partake of the reality of Jesus Christ in worship only as they partake of the reality of the world. If worship is to possess integrity, its action must be held within this truth as in a vise (p. 347).

But Hoon also knows that pastors dedicated to church renewal have sometimes used worship merely as a goad to social action. He refers to such utilitarianism as a corruption in which "a shift in the liturgical center of gravity has taken place" (p. 52).

Hoon has no patience with rigidity in worship: Worship cannot be bound by set formulas, for the majesty and mystery of God stand over against all such forms—whether they be the stiff use of Isaiah 6:1-8 as a

paradigm for liturgical order, the hard-headed insistence that the sermon must directly follow the reading of the Scriptures, or the demand that the opening hymn be one of praise and adoration. Hoon's lack of reverence for such liturgical sacred cows may elevate the reader's blood pressure, but only temporarily (unless the brain is disengaged); for Hoon is no liturgical anarchist, and he is never irresponsible in his criticism. He does not demand that we agree with him, only that we ponder what he has to say. Furthermore, he argues that a certain tentativeness in liturgical matters is a sign of health and wisdom.

The principal weakness of the book is in its organization, not in its content. Because this is a collection of essays written over a period of nine years, forward motion is frequently missing, and the reader recognizes that he has been over similar ground in a previous chapter. This deficiency will be minimized, however, if the book is read slowly and in short sections. In fact, the depth of liturgical thought would demand this kind of reading even if the book were organized differently. Nor is this a work which should be read once and then put on the shelf. The pastor who takes his liturgical task seriously should keep this volume near at hand, for it is not the kind of book which will soon be dated. By looking into it periodically, the pastor can evaluate his presuppositions and practices and can grow in his ministry as theologian-liturgist.

LAURENCE H. STOOKEY

*A Colloquy on Christian Education*, by John H. Westerhoff, III (ed.). The Pilgrim Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1972. Pp. 254. \$5.95.

This volume is a kind of smorgasbord on Christian Education in the present situation. It contains all you want to know about the subject without having to buy a lot of separate books about special aspects in the field. John H. Westerhoff, III is the editor of *Colloquy*, a journal devoted to Christian Education, and the author of *Values for Tomorrow's Children* (Pilgrim Press, 1970). He is a graduate of Ursinus College, Harvard Divinity School, and has lectured in education and communications at Harvard, Princeton

and Union (New York) seminaries. He is a consultant to NBC-TV in children's programming, as well as a consultant to the American Association of University Women and The National Education Association on Education and Communications.

The volume is a compilation of 26 essays by Christian and church educators, including C. Ellis Nelson, D. Campbell Wyckoff, Randolph C. Miller, Robert W. Lynn, Rachel Henderlite, Sara Little, Roger Shinn, Philip H. Phenix, James E. Loder, and others. The essays are arranged in three parts: Sound Foundations; Acting Now; Anticipating the Future. Westerhoff writes the introduction on *An Age of Transition*, and the epilogue on *The Signs of the Times*. The nature, current methods and prospects for Christian Education are covered.

Every contribution acknowledges that great changes have been made in Christian Education. It, like theology, is in a state of fluidity. No longer is Christian Education confined to the Sunday School, nor is it a way of transmitting a tradition through an effective method. And Christian Education is in crisis whether in the Protestant Sunday School or the Roman Catholic parochial school. But Christian education is essential for the church's survival.

Roger Shinn maintains that education is a mystery and that much of the individual's education is not programmed. He lists three aspects of interest in education: the first is intellectual or cognitive; the second is activist which leads to involvement; the third is education in depth, which leads to "interiorization." Today, he would emphasize the third, as well as self-understanding, self-criticism, and worship. He would warn against dogmatism and self-righteousness. Sarah Little writes of the change that took place around 1961 to change the values and endeavors of Christian Educators from emphasis upon the cognitive to the affective and the social.

The authors write not about a new definition of Christian education; rather they suggest new frontiers. They all agree that denominational education has had it. They emphasize learning by doing and living and participating. Theological insight comes through reflection upon meaningful experiences. The total church is the community of learning. The detailed curriculum is out;

rather, church schools may operate without one.

Several essays describe new models of work with youth, models of worship, celebrations. Loder asks whether method and message are not intimately related. Much emphasis is placed upon accomplishment in any educational activity. A suggestive chapter deals with "value education." D. Campbell Wyckoff with his wide knowledge of curriculum materials lists all the available helps which can assist the creative educator without being a slave to any one of them.

Rachel Henderlite comes as near to anyone in the symposium to dealing with the theology of Christian Education. Quoting E. Ellis Nelson, that Christian Education is in a "demoralized state" she states that the problem in Christian Education can be put in the word of Charles E. Silberman about public education: Mindlessness. And from that starting point she describes what Christian Education may be in the church. Philip H. Phenix writes about education for faith and suggests that a living faith can be inspired only with a community that has hope; that those who teach do so in the spirit of love; that faith requires opportunities for appropriate action on the part of the learner; and that faith must take account of the life of reason (namely, reason and faith belong together, not that faith rests only on reason).

This volume is too rich in variety for any reviewer to do it justice. Perhaps this richness is one of the weaknesses of the book. However, its redeeming feature is that the chapters are short! Further, the fare is of such wide concern that the professional educator as well as the layman will find it most helpful in discovering where we are in Christian education today. The educational world is filled with exciting ferment. Perhaps its greatest problem is in its lack of a clear sense of direction. Robert Lynn suggests that more emphasis now needs to be placed upon the "know-why" instead of the "know-how." And this lack of theological direction inevitably affects the Christian educator's personal motivation and methodology. If Christian education is to elicit faith and lead persons into a meaningful membership in God's community of mission and destiny then those who seek to elicit and to lead may have to be more deeply committed and more warmly

enthused about the meaning of the Christian faith in a time like this.

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

*Reason, Faith and Love*, by Joseph E. McCabe (Foreword by C. J. Lynch). The Parthenon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1972. Pp. 155. (No price given.)

The publication of the twelve addresses in this volume was made possible by Donald MacKay, Class of 1935, of Coe College. He was a member and former Chairman of the college's Board of Trustees. This book was published in grateful memory of his college president, the late Harry Morehouse Gage. Dr. Gage was president of Coe from 1920-1941. He was succeeded by Dr. McCabe, who since 1970 has been named Chancellor.

Dr. McCabe has had a distinguished career: as naval chaplain, pastor, faculty member, author, college president, and now Chancellor of Coe College. He was president of the Presbyterian College Union and of the Iowa College Association. He was a member of the College Entrance Examination Board and of the Air Force Advisory Panel. He was chairman of the Board of Directors of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest. He is chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Beirut College for Women in Lebanon.

The chapters in this volume are addresses delivered to students during the 1960's. For the most part they are convocation and baccalaureate addresses presented to Coe students, but their contents were also presented to wider audiences in various academic centers: the University of Iowa, Earlham College, Mt. Mercy College, Trinity University, the University of Indiana, and other institutions. These addresses reveal Dr. McCabe's clear grasp of the human situation with its vanities and ambiguities, and his philosophy of life as it relates to liberal education. His chief concern in college and university life has been "the enriching relationship between authentic religious faith and liberal education."

Some of the topics of his addresses express the thrust of the author's thought: The Scholar in the Judeo-Christian Tradition; Towards the Renewal of Western Man; Education as Being and Meeting; Tough-mindedness and the Creative Deed; The River of Student Unrest; Love's not Time's Fool.

To read these addresses is "an exciting intellectual experience." His quotations from a wide range of resources indicates the author's catholicity of mind. His method of presentation sets off each sentence as a gem of mature wisdom. Almost every statement cries out for quotation, indeed placarding on some global billboard. But always the central thrust of the author's philosophy comes through: "Throughout history, when either reason or faith has been enthroned to the exclusion of the other, the result has been the impoverishment of the human spirit." Dr. McCabe advocates a faith filled reason-informed humanism as the way to meet life's inexplicable ambiguities.

Because these chapters distill the ripe and rich wisdom of a dedicated educator, the reader will be enriched, informed and inspired by a careful encounter with the contents of *Reason, Faith and Love*.

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

*The Gospel in a Broken World*, by John H. Snow (Foreword by Dean Harvey H. Guthrie). Pilgrim Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1972. Pp. 114. \$4.95.

"This book is not preaching, but about preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ," writes Dean Guthrie in the Foreword. I would add that it is about preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ in "an apocalyptic age."

The author, John H. Snow, is now Professor of Pastoral Theology at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, a position he now occupies after serving for five years as chaplain to Episcopal students at Princeton University. Prior to that he served as a parish minister in Hamilton and Cambridge, Massachusetts. He has been Director of Gould Farm and Head of St. Michael's School at Newport, Rhode Island.

Snow is struggling with the problem of articulating the Gospel in a broken world, a world similar to that which the Christian faith confronted as it entered the Græco-Roman world. He believes that we are far enough into a new culture which is succeeding classical western culture so that we may articulate the Gospel in the idiom of the new culture. He therefore does not recite inherited terms nor indulge in relevant fads that smother the Gospel. He refuses to surrender



the Gospel in a desperate search for relevance. He discusses the false messiahs of technology, science, armed force, and revolution, and finds them bankrupt of all resources to save society.

His analysis of this broken world is penetrating and frightening. Society is exploited by thievery institutions that are supposed to serve it. This exploitation leads to the failure of basic trust, "that mystical cohesive force which determines whether a society will be viable or not." Even the church engaged in this exploitation, until it awoke to see that this way meant death to the church as church. Faced with an apocalyptic time, Snow evaluates all the ironies of response to it: underground church, death-of-God theology, outright abandonment of all institutional ties and all worship, to outright angry atheism. All of these have run their course; they are like another Edsel.

We are now being detained on our pilgrimage toward the light "as a judgment on our having had too many affairs with too many harlots." People know that science, technology, politics, armed might, and even nude sensitivity groups will not save us. And many Christians are not sure revolution will save us whether of the right or the left. One cannot escape the feeling that we face what the early Christians faced: massive persecution, and a final convulsive struggle between the God revealed in Jesus Christ and Satan, the Great Jailer. It is now, as then, a struggle for the possession of the soul of man. The question we face is: "What is the mode of the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in apocalyptic times?"

Snow went through a profound experience in wrestling with Teilhard's *The Phenomenon of Man*. Further, he criticizes Anselm's emphasis upon guilt, and praises Abelard's emphasis upon God's love and acceptance, especially for an age that is already burdened with the sense of guilt. The cross is to be interpreted not in terms of guilt but of tragedy.

The author sees signs of promise in Teilhard's concept of the equality of "withinness"; in his concept that evolution moves from the simple to the complex; in his proposal that man is "evolution become conscious of itself." He also sees signs of hope in a new possibility of love in marriage, in some

communes, in the moon flights and the new music (he has a positive interpretation of Elvis Presley). What Snow wants is a salvation of the present human being and situation by a revolution which will create a new consciousness, by a "quantum leap" which he finds in the Incarnation. The way to this new consciousness is not through submission to the demands of a punishing superego, but through the tragedy of the cross to a new life beyond. "The revolution in consciousness is the important revolution of our time." These "signs" must be celebrated as signs of God's presence in the world, and especially when humans hold themselves in such low regard.

An interesting chapter is devoted to the student mentality of our apocalyptic time. Today's students are "the generation of the apocalypse." In it he makes the reader aware of the mood of a Christian or a church that holds a radically eschatological faith. He describes how the early church lived with such a faith. Many youth today sense this eschatological "end" and they are raising many questions about the free enterprise system, the waste of natural resources, and the fact that education and exhortation do not change the customary patterns of men. "Only the felt sense that they are here because God wants them here can change them, that he has created them for good, for keeps, for real, to live in communion with him not just now but in eternity, and that the two are one and a cause for celebration and joy and thanksgiving. How we communicate this simple theology, so that it is heard and felt and realized is the task of theology and the church in an apocalyptic age."

While there are positions in this volume with which readers will disagree, there are insights in it regarding the character of our broken world, regarding signs of God's work in our world, and regarding sin, grace, death, resurrection, creation, and life, as found in the Christian heritage that are apropos to a broken and apocalyptic age. The reader will find in Snow's pilgrimage someone who can help him to understand and articulate what it means to be a Christian in our time, even though he may not find in his book a definite "mode" of communicating the Christian faith.

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN



*Bare Ruined Choirs: Doubt, Prophecy, and Radical Religion*, by Garry Wills. Doubleday & Company, New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 272. \$7.95.

Garry Wills is the well-known author of *Nixon Agonistes*. This volume is something of a sequel in which he provides a more penetrating, probing, passionate and prophetic diagnosis of the Roman Catholic Church—and also of American culture. Trained as a classicist, a Yale Ph.D., he writes with the clarity and realism of the newspaper columnist and lecturer, that he is.

The words in the title of the book describe the thrust of Wills' thesis: bare, ruined, doubt, prophecy, radical religion. The author starts with the assumption that the Roman Catholic Church was, or regarded itself as—the Church. As such, it represented certainty in the human situation. But the forces of change have brought the Church into "disarray." It now faces "institutional breakdown." The great expectations of Vatican Council II have not been realized. A crisis in authority has resulted. The promise of Pope John XXIII for a church that at once maintained its authority and related to the modern world has not been realized; indeed, in some instances just the reverse has resulted. Even the Jesuits and their schools are suffering reverses. What has happened?

Wills draws a similar parallel regarding American culture and the other John, namely, President Kennedy. The young Roman Catholic President aroused high hopes for the country. But Kennedy's "Camelot," the New Frontier, has suffered demise. What happened?

Wills finds the church's crisis in itself. Relying on his careful study of the church as well as his own Catholic nurture, he zeroes in on the "pretended faith that makes real faith impossible." The church developed a concept of itself as almost immutable and unchangeable. "Those in it were isolated from reality both in the world and in the church." "It was a world of deceptions, too, and deliberate blindnesses; of things one should not see, and of consequent pretending not to see them." "Doubts were hidden. . . ."

Then came Vatican Council II, and the church's "dirty little secret" was out. Accepted matters now were open to question.

The world of parish priests and sisters was exposed to view and subject to discussion. Wills describes the changes that took place in the liturgical crisis, changes that gave traumatic shocks to many parishioners and provided meager real results. Old and familiar practices were changed, and innovations seemed to put the whole system into question. But the author maintains that only in this way could the shell-like nature of the existing church be exposed as unreal. "A great deal ended when the Latin sung Mass ended."

What happened after Pope John and President John Kennedy? The Protestant will be able to see that a springtime of promise for the renewal of the Church, such as Vatican Council II offered, may result in a polarization between those who go to the extreme left or the extreme right. At least, this is what happened—and continues to happen—in the Roman Church. Similarly, the promise of The New Frontier, later The Great Society, may also result in extremist polarizations between those who go right and those who go left. Wills claims that this is what happened in church and culture. It makes fascinating reading to see the influence of Teilhard de Chardin and Harvey Cox on President Kennedy and his associates. And Wills maintains that it was Kennedy who through his strong stand on the separation of church from state that not only split the Roman Catholic church on the relation of the sacred to the secular, but paved the way for the "death of God" theology and its entire negativistic consequences.

Wills has some harsh things to say about Pius XII, Paul VI, Sister Jacqueline Grennan (Wechsler), as well as "false theologians," bad faith, tyrannical cowardice in the church. With a wealth of information and a penetrating mind, he exposes the course of happenings since Vatican Council II. But he is not hopeless. With reliance upon patristic tradition, Scriptural interpretation, and logical argument he dismisses "contraception" and "clerical celibacy" as "Mickey Mouse" issues, and drives towards the necessity for integrity and the spirit of martyrdom if the Roman Catholic, or any other church, is to become the church.

Present doubt is the climate in which radical Christianity may be born. He finds the

present-day saint in a Jew like Waskow, a Protestant like Stringfellow, a Catholic like Berrigan. Such men "grow closer together the more profoundly they reflect on and reflect Exodus, and Immersion, and Resurrection." Wills closes his book with these statements: "The path to one's buried self runs through the unearthing of one's corporate past, that has (like all our private pasts) been betrayed, its vision lost, its call unheeded. The best things in the church, as in a nation, or in individuals, are hidden and partly disowned, the vital impulse buried under all our cowardly misuses of it—as the life of a nation lies under and is oppressed by its crude governing machinery; as the self lies far below the various roles imposed on or adopted by it; as covenant and gospel run, subterranean, beneath temple and cathedral. Life's streams lie far down, for us, below the surface of our lives where we must look for them. It is time to join the underground."

Wills calls for a new dedication that is total, but a commitment that does not recover a rigid dogmatism, or move into the marshes of a relevant secular theology. Reform had to come for change made it inevitable. What Wills wants is a generation of prophetic leadership that is at once intelligent, sensitive to a dynamic Christian tradition, and passionate in its personal faith in and love for Jesus Christ.

Some readers will squirm in discomfort caused by Wills' radical and at times wild attack upon the Roman Catholic Church. There are criticisms here that sound like Martin Luther, Søren Kierkegaard and Paul Blanchard. But through it all Wills reveals a deep love for the Church, a love that hates falsehood and incompetence and compromise and ignorance and immaturity. And what he writes applies to the sickness and the health of every Christian Church.

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN

*My Brother Paul*, by Richard L. Rubenstein. New York: Harper & Row, New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 209. \$5.95.

For a Jew to write a book entitled *My Brother Paul* is truly remarkable. To read the book is an even more remarkable experience. For most Jews, Paul is the supreme Apostate who Hellenized the simple Gospel

and whose tirades against the Jews of his day are largely responsible for the anti-Semitism of later times. For Rubenstein, on the other hand, Paul was an elder brother who had attempted a spiritual journey like his two thousand years ago.

Like Paul the author sought to have a life of ever greater compliance with rabbinic law; like Paul he discovered that his compliance only heightened his sense of unworthiness and anxiety. Stung by the death of his three-month-old son, Rabbi Rubenstein found that obedience to the law gave him no escape from mortality. From this point on, Paul and Rubenstein part company. The road to personal integration for Paul was identification with the Risen Lord whom he met on the road to Damascus; Rubenstein found his way to self-acceptance through psychoanalytic insight.

Professor Rubenstein, who teaches in the department of religion at Florida State University, published a book in 1968, entitled *The Religious Imagination*, in which he used the psychoanalytic method to interpret the religion of the rabbis. Now he takes up the task of producing a sympathetic psychoanalytic portrait of the Apostle Paul.

The basic problem with Paul, as with Rubenstein, was to resolve the conflict between experience and tradition. By identifying himself with Christ, the crucified and risen older brother, (*cf.* his frequent use of the phrase "in Christ"; Phil. 1:21: "For to me to live is Christ"; Gal. 2:20: "It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me.") Paul was able to accept the authority of his own experience as over against that of traditional Judaism. In this identification with the older brother rather than with the Father Lawgiver of Judaism Paul found one who "shared with the younger brothers their defeats, their humiliations, and their complex relation with the mysterious and inaccessible Father," and who, by experiencing the depth of human suffering on the cross and thus brought about victory over death, "fulfilled the most potent of all human yearnings, the attainment of eternal life" (pp. 28-29).

Symbolically the Christian identifies with Christ by partaking of His body and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; symbolically the baptismal waters of regeneration release the Christian from the anxieties and fears of death and make him the heir of

eternal life. In this way the basic human ambivalences are resolved: law and freedom, the fear of death and the hope for life after death, the desire for omnipotence and the fears of mortality, annihilation and the yearning for fulfillment.

In a brilliant display of "psycho-hermeneutics," Rubenstein subjects to psychoanalysis the main theological themes of Paul's thinking: baptism, the concept of the Church as the Body of Christ, the Lord's Supper, the New Israel, and the Last Adam. In these theological discussions Rabbi Rubenstein combines the insights of contemporary psychoanalytic thought with the best New Testament scholarship.

One can hardly believe that this book was written by a Jewish atheist who comes very close to laying bare the psychological meaning of the Christian ethos itself. To be sure, the Christian may look in vain for that element of personal faith which is basic to Paul's experience and theology, and Jews will hardly be moved by a disaffected rabbi to accept Paul as their elder brother. But both Jew and Christian will gain new insights into their religions by reading this book.

The reviewer would like to see this work on the "revolutionary Jewish mystic" discussed in many Jewish-Christian dialogues across the country. The brotherly dialogue between Paul and a modern Rabbi is most pertinent for Jewish-Christian relations today.

CHARLES T. FRITSCH

*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Kittel), ed. by Gerhard Friedrich (trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley). Vol. VIII. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1972. Pp. 620. \$18.50.

The indefatigable translator of Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Dr. G. W. Bromiley of Fuller Theological Seminary, has finished yet another volume of that monumental Dictionary. Having begun early in the 1960's to translate vol. I, which had been published in Germany in 1933, Bromiley has now reached vol. VIII, and is therefore current with the German original.

The more than forty articles in the present

volume extend from *tapeinos* to *hypsisitos*. Significant contributions include those on "tax-collector" by Otto Michel of Tübingen, "type" and "water" by Leonhard Goppelt of Munich, and "Son of Man" by Carsten Colpe of Göttingen. The last-mentioned article is a short book in itself, for it runs to 78 pages!

It is gratifying to know that this important Dictionary is now approaching completion, and that it will be available in three languages, for, in addition to English it is also being translated into Italian. One recalls that the late Emil Brunner once declared that Kittel's *Theological Dictionary* was, in his opinion, the most important Protestant exegetical work on the New Testament since Calvin.

BRUCE M. METZGER

*Concordia Bible with Notes: New Testament*, ed. by Martin H. Franzmann. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1971. Pp. x + 541 (16 pages of maps). \$8.95.

In 1946 the Concordia Publishing House issued an edition of the King James (or Authorized) Version, called the *Concordia Bible with Notes*. Bound in black and set in rather small-sized type, the volume contained explanatory notes prepared by Dr. John Theodore Mueller. Now, a quarter of a century later, the publishers have brought out the New Testament volume of the *Concordia Bible* in a new format, and with new comments based on the Revised Standard Version.

When the reader opens this handsome volume in red binding he is struck by the superior typographical layout. The pages, each measuring an ample 7 x 10 inches, present at the top the Revised Standard Version (second edition) set in one column, with two columns underneath of comments set in smaller but quite legible type. The introduction to each of the New Testament books as well as the extensive comments on each page were written by Dr. Martin H. Franzmann, who, after teaching at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, from 1946 until 1969, was in that year appointed tutor at Westfield House, Cambridge, England.

In the introductions Franzmann outlines the purpose, content, and setting of each



book. In the explanatory notes he comments on specific words, phrases, and concepts in the text that call for further clarification. Franzmann does not overlook exegetical difficulties, but his main emphasis is to set forth the central message of each book of the New Testament as clearly and succinctly as possible.

The comments are forthright and vigorous. Here and there Franzmann prefers the marginal rendering of the RSV (as at Rom. 9:5 and Gal. 4:25). The enigmatic baptism for the dead (I Cor. 15:29) is taken to refer to a situation where "a man is moved to accept the faith and be baptized by the pleadings of a dying relative or friend." Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison (I Pet. 3:19) refers to his "triumph over the demonic powers to whom he proclaimed their defeat and deposition." Following Augustine, Franzmann takes the one thousand years of Rev. 20 as beginning at the birth of the Messiah.

The volume presents the text of the recently completed second edition of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament. This second edition profits from the advances in textual and linguistic studies published since the RSV New Testament was first issued twenty-five years ago. The Standard Bible Committee has incorporated scores of changes in text and marginal notes, as well as in translation, all of them designed to present to the reader a more accurate text expressed in the most suitable English rendering.

This volume provides students and others with a helpful study edition of the New Testament embodying in reality a one-volume commentary on the Scripture text. Many will await with eagerness the completion of the companion volume containing notes in the Old Testament.

BRUCE M. METZGER

*The Authority of the Bible*, by Donald G. Miller. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1972. Pp. 139. \$2.25.

This paperback contains the Carson Memorial Lectures on *The Authority of the Bible* delivered at the First Presbyterian Church, Richmond, Virginia, and intended as a popular study and not as a scholarly

work for theologians. In this purpose it is an admirable success.

The author, a former Professor of New Testament, Union Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, and recently President of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, has one central conviction in this volume, namely that "God is the real author" of the teachings of the Old and New Testaments. Miller is convinced that what the Church needs is to listen attentively for the voice of the living God through the Bible.

He places the authority of the Bible over against the authority of Christian experience and the Christian Church, both of which are important but not final as are the teachings of the Bible. And the touchstone of their authority is Christ in the Scriptures. "And who do you say that I am?" asked Christ of his disciples. The answer to this question is the key to the authority of the Bible, Jesus Christ the Son of God.

In some ways these lectures are a tract for the times. They deal with the method of social change, politics and the pulpit, moral values, economics, and the kind of authority the Church should exercise. A quotation from this book illustrates Miller's point of view:

"It seems clear that those who advocate the Church's direct intervention in the problems of public life are highly selective in the spheres of their advocacy. They argue in many instances that morals cannot be legislated. Therefore, in the areas of sex, pornography, divorce, Sunday 'blue laws,' abortion, alcoholic beverages, marijuana, and drugs, and in the discipline of students in any realm beyond the academic, the coercive pressures of law should be removed. On the other hand, in matters of race, poverty, war, and ecology, many insist that the Church as Church should press for binding legislation and take any means of forcing their views on others, even at the expense of the total overthrow of the government. There may be a consistency hidden in what seems to be a strange contradiction here, but I find it difficult to see."

Miller ends his lectures with an appropriate appeal to the authority of Christ. "He claims final authority over us—on values, in decisions, in actions, in life, in death, at the final Judgment."



These lectures espouse the evangelical view of the authority of the Bible and in an able fashion. We recommend the volume especially for laymen.

EDWIN H. RIAN

*Robert Newton Flew, 1886-1962*, by Gordon S. Wakefield. Epworth Press, London, 1971. Pp. 268. £3.

Robert Newton Flew was one of the best-known English Methodist ministers during the first half, and especially the second quarter, of the twentieth century. It was not for his preaching that he was particularly famous, though he was an able and effective pulpiteer. He was noted, rather, for his achievements as a theological educator, as a Christian theologian, and as an active and influential participator in the ecumenical movement.

In this biography Gordon S. Wakefield, a friend and former student of Flew, does three main things. First, he gives an account of Flew's public career—his education at Oxford and Marburg, his ministry in London and the ecclesiastical honors which came to him, notably the Moderatorship of the Free Church Federal Council in 1945 and the Presidency of the Methodist Conference in 1946. He acknowledges Flew's weakness for associating with the great and the near great, quoting the apocryphal story of how Flew once inadvertently changed the Sanctus in the Communion Service so that it ran "With Bishops and Archbishops and all the company of heaven" (p. 203). He speaks frankly about Flew's disappointment at not being appointed to the Norris-Hulse chair of Divinity at Cambridge University in 1935, when C. H. Dodd—a much better qualified candidate, was named. But mainly he focuses on Flew's work first as Tutor (1927) and then as Principal (1935-57) of Wesley House, Cambridge, a Methodist Theological Seminary. Under Flew's leadership this school became a most influential educational institution, not only training many fine pastors for the Methodist ministry, but also producing such excellent scholars as C. K. Barrett, Marcus Ward, Philip S. Watson, and E. Gordon Rupp.

Secondly, Mr. Wakefield analyzes Flew's theological contribution. His major works in

the theological field were *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (1934) and *Jesus and His Church* (1938). Wakefield summarizes the arguments of both these volumes, evaluates them in the light of subsequent discussions of their respective themes, and concludes that "the theology of Robert Newton Flew, good in its time, may still preserve some essential elements of the gospel, which must not be lost by future generations" (p. 158-59).

In the third place, Mr. Wakefield deals with Flew's contribution to the ecumenical movement. He was appointed a member of the Faith and Order Continuation Committee in 1934, and in this capacity attended all the important conferences sponsored by this movement, including the meetings at Amsterdam in 1948 at which Faith and Order merged with Life and Work to form the World Council of Churches, till the conference at Lund in 1952, by which time Flew had become Vice-Chairman.

This interesting book tells the story of an able and dedicated Christian who devoted his life to the service of Christ's church as an English Methodist, but who, at the same time, made a valuable contribution to the ecumenical Christian fellowship which transcends all denominations.

NORMAN V. HOPE

*The Validity of the Christian Mission*, by Elton Trueblood. Harper & Row, New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 113. \$2.95.

In this book Dr. Elton Trueblood, who has written so helpfully on so many aspects of Christian thought and life, addresses himself to the centrally important question of the validity of the Christian mission in today's world.

Dr. Trueblood begins by noting the criticisms which are made today of the Christian missionary enterprise. These are basically two in number. The first contends that Christians have no right to export their religion when it has not done so well at home. Conceding that Christianity has not been so effective in "sending" countries as it might be, he argues that this is no reason for not sending Christian missionaries abroad; for in no other area of activity does failure to reach perfection

inhibit further action. For example, education has not done so well in the U.S.A. as it might have; but this is not considered to be any reason for closing down the educational enterprise. Christianity's reach will always exceed its grasp, and perfection will never be realized in this world; but this should not be allowed to cut the nerve of Christian missions either at home or abroad.

The second basic objection to Christian foreign missions is based on the principle of toleration, and particularly the doctrine of cultural relativism, i.e., the idea that each community develops that culture and, with it, that religion best suited to its needs; and to interfere with the religion of any group may undermine its whole culture. But, contends Dr. Trueblood, this viewpoint implies that there are no objective moral standards, and therefore no recognized criteria of Judgement. In fact, however, it is generally admitted—even by the most vociferous critics of Christian missions—that certain cultural systems need to be changed—for example those based on slavery or racism; and so do certain religions—for example, those which degrade womanhood or which keep their adherents in a chronic state of fear.

Having disposed of these objections to Christian missions, Dr. Trueblood goes on to state the positive case for them. That case is basically this, that Christianity is true, that "it conforms to reality as does no other alternative of which we are aware" (Pp. 56). There is cumulative evidence as to the truth of the Christian revelation—for example, of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ; and as an unquestioned fact of practical experience for almost two thousand years and throughout the whole inhabited world Christianity has proved its ability to change lives for the better as no other religion or ideology has been able to do.

Since this is so, Christianity is a truly world faith in the sense in which no other religion is; and what Christians are called upon to do is to witness to the truth and power of the Christian gospel, not only by the Christ-like quality of their lives, but also by the persuasion of their verbal testimony. This witness is the responsibility not merely of professional ministers and missionaries, but of Christian laymen as well: they are expected to witness for Jesus Christ wherever they

are—of course, at home in so-called "sending" countries, but also in "receiving" countries should they happen to be there on business or for any other reason. For laymen to witness most effectively, however, they require to be adequately instructed in the meaning and implications of the Christian gospel, so that in truth they may be able to give a reason for the faith that is in them. In this way Christians will become the salt, light and leaven of the world which Jesus intended them to be.

In this book Dr. Trueblood has presented a cogently argued case for the validity of the Christian mission in the present-day world. He has also done two other things—he has analyzed what this mission means and involves, and he has outlined a strategy for implementing it. His book will give confidence to those Christians who are already convinced of the necessity of the Christian missionary enterprise; and hopefully it will persuade many who at present view the Christian mission, at least in its foreign dimensions, with doubt and disapproval.

NORMAN V. HOPE

*Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*, by Henry Chadwick. Oxford University Press, New York, N.Y., 1966. Pp. 170. \$4.00.

This is a superb book. In it Professor Chadwick presents studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen. His first chapter, "The Vindication of Christianity," deals with Justin. The second chapter, about Clement, is called "The Liberal Puritan." The third chapter, "The Illiberal Humanist," is about Origen. The last chapter is titled, "The Perennial Issue."

Chadwick uses the chapter divisions, but he does not let them use him, e.g., in the first chapter, mainly about Justin, there is considerable material about Celsus. He can turn a phrase; he speaks of Clement writing a book ". . . almost as if his purpose were to empty the contents of a commonplace book." And he wryly calls our attention to the fact that, "In the Bible the only two who separate their birthday are Pharaoh and Herod."

Chadwick's control of his material is evident. He is learned, without being pedantic. The book demands concentration, but is more than worth the effort. A number of the issues Chadwick deals with are under discussion

today, and his treatment is all the more valuable because he is not guilty of forcing the parallels.

ROBERT S. BEAMAN

Graduate School  
Temple University

# Book Notes

by DONALD MACLEOD

BOYD, Malcolm, *The Lover*. Word Books, Waco, Texas, 1972. Pp. 176. \$4.95.

As a literary stylist, Malcolm Boyd can turn an imaginative and descriptive phrase and by his realism shock us out of our traditional complacencies. He has the happy faculty of drawing intensely human images from the workaday world with its "trivial round and common task." However, one wonders in the end what Boyd has got to say to us. His meditations are never of the depth or quality of an à Kempis who is at least eminently quotable. True, Boyd has not tossed out recklessly the institutional church; he craves a new organism within it. But this fond hope is unfortunately as vague as *The Lover*, a quasi-Wordsworthian presence whose only word seems to be "Now you feel me and now you don't." Moreover, suppose one were to grant the totality of Boyd's belief, including his notion of "last things," what case could one make for an urge for human concern?

FLESCHE, Rudolf. *Say What You Mean*. Harper & Row, New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 163. \$5.95.

Ever since the appearance of *The Art of Plain Talk*, Rudolf Flesch has had a pronounced influence upon American literary style and expression. He would agree, of course, with Buffon when he said, *Le style est l'homme même*; yet Flesch has done much to provide writers with a system of correctives by which their offerings are made easy and pleasant to read. In the course of twelve pithy chapters, amply illustrated, he describes the character of good writing and spells out a system of ground rules by which correspondence, sermons, and other communications media can avoid verbal pollution and speak in plain prose.

FORD, D. W. Cleverley. *Preaching through the Christian Year*. A. R. Mowbray Co., London, 1971. Pp. 126. £1.

Few writers of pulpit materials on either side of the Atlantic are giving us such con-

sistently high quality materials as D. W. Cleverley Ford, Director of the College of Preachers, London, England. The author of nearly a dozen volumes of sermons and on the craftsmanship of preaching, Prebendary Ford now takes up the Christian Year and provides succinct and suggestive studies of appropriate texts and pericopes. "Preaching," he writes, "is proclaiming the Kingdom of God to specific people in a specific place according to their need" (p. 2). Here in forty-three brief sermons he puts old truths into new frames and in more than a few apt illustrations he indicates the way spiritual principles should permeate the needs and crises of our common life.

HENDERSON, Charles P. *The Nixon Theology*. Harper & Row, New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 210. \$6.95.

This book breaks new ground. It is a study of the theological presuppositions of an American president and of their peculiar bearing upon his personality, his political style, and the conduct of his office. The author, who is assistant dean of the Chapel of Princeton University, has written a very perceptive and well-annotated monograph that deserves sober reflection. With the presidential election over and won, however, its germaneness will be suspended until some future historian adds this volume to his research enterprise. Readers cannot escape the haunting question: why was this book written? Technically this book is competently done. Its spirit, however, lowers it to a tissue of cynicism.

MACLENNAN, David A. *Preaching Values in Today's English Version*. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1972. Pp. 192. \$4.75.

When the American Bible Society published *Good News for Modern Man* in 1966, no one forecast for any such book so eager and friendly a reception. Almost seventeen million copies have been sold, which rates it the best-selling paperback ever. In keeping with a tradition once begun by Halford E.



Luccock of Yale, David A. MacLennan (at one time Luccock's colleague) has selected 149 segments from this new scripture translation and prepared sermon digests on each one. Dr. MacLennan is unfailingly interesting, has a vivid imagination, and writes out of a preaching ministry which draws large congregations to his Florida church. This volume suggests the numerous sermonic possibilities in this and other newer versions of the scriptures.

MEEK, Frederick M. *The Bethlehem Inn and Other Christmas Stories*. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1972. Pp. 126. \$4.95.

A test of even a strong preacher in his ability to tell a story. Frederick Meek, minister for twenty-five years of Old South Church in Boston, is a master craftsman at both of these disciplines. This is a unique Christmas book, an inspirational gift to be cherished and re-read. These imaginative stories were told originally at Christmas Eve services and, as the jacket says, "they are beautiful in their simplicity and universal in their appeal." In a competent and ingenious way, Dr. Meek captures the wonder and fascination of the Advent spirit and blends these with the simple events made all too familiar with time.

MELTON, David. *This Man—Jesus*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 58. \$3.95.

This illustrated book was composed for children but like a "junior sermon," many older folk will eavesdrop and enjoy it. Through the media of word and picture, David Melton unfolds in marvelous simplicity the life and significance of the Man of Galilee. Each illustration is accompanied by an explanatory footnote and helps when seen along with the reading text to bring out the strength of the person of Christ. An ideal book for a gift presentation to a junior boy or girl.

POLLOCK, John. *George Whitefield and The Great Awakening*. Doubleday & Company, New York, N.Y., 1972. Pp. 272. \$6.95.

The lives of great religious leaders have become for John Pollock, a British clergyman, the substance with which now he can

"preach with my pen." Always an interesting story-teller, Pollock draws upon Whitefield's sermons, diaries, and the annals of his colleagues—the Wesleys and Edwards—to present a very human portrait of the great evangelist. His biographies include Billy Graham, L. Nelson Bell, and the Apostle Paul. With an art for capturing the interesting detail and re-presenting the historical incident in real persons, Pollock makes Whitefield's career and influence a vivid chapter in the religious history of America.

POOVEY, W. A. *Let Us Adore Him*. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn., 1972. Pp. 126. \$2.95.

The professor of preaching at Wartburg Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa, has gained a well deserved reputation for his dramas on Lenten themes and on parables. Dr. Poovey explores in this new volume the subjects and themes of Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany and provides joint programs of drama and meditation. Here are six chapters (four for Advent; one for Christmas; one for Epiphany), each comprised of a drama ("The Voice in the Wilderness," "No Silent Night," etc.) and a meditation ("The Third Advent," "The God Who Doesn't Lie," etc.) based upon a Scripture text. These are excellent resource materials for either large or small congregations where the director may shape the presentation according to the resources available.

PRESTWOOD, Charles. *A New Breed of Clergy*. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1972. Pp. 108. \$1.95 (paper).

Chairman of the Sociology Department at Albright College (Reading, Penna.), Professor Prestwood has served in four parishes and draws upon his own personal experience and reflection. Chapters 13, 14, and the Conclusion are both original and clever. Most of the earlier part of the book, however, consists of leveling blame by means of broad statements that cannot be authenticated (e.g., on p. 33 he writes, "Seminaries have almost no admission standards except a college diploma and a warm body"). Moreover, much of the new "breed" of clergy is not "new" anymore (1960's, maybe). Happily the author is not anti-Church; he pleads for awareness and

vitality generally, but he should not overlook where it is today both actual and in particular.

STEWART, James S. *River of Life*. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1972. Pp. 160. \$3.50.

For those to whom the name of James S. Stewart has been synonymous with great evangelical preaching, the appearance of another book of sermons from his pen will be met with more than ordinary acclaim. It was said of the Master that "the common people heard him gladly." It has been said of an occasional pulpiteer that he was "a preacher's preacher." Professor Stewart combines both qualifications to a remarkable degree and, at the same time, has given us one of the most exciting, scholarly studies of St. Paul, *A Man in Christ*. This fourth book of sermons maintains the splendid tradition of the earlier volumes—scholarly, Christo-centric, abounding in literary allusions, and invariably unfolding fresh facets of the Gospel.

URDANG, Laurence (ed.). *Dictionary of Misunderstood, Misused, Mispronounced Words*. Quadrangle Books, Inc. (New York Times Company), 1972. Pp. 377. \$7.95.

The editor's purpose in this compilation is to list "the words whose meanings you don't know." A professional lexicographer, Laurence Urdang, has had a life-long interest in words, climaxed in 1966 by his unabridged edition of *The Random House Dictionary* with its 260,000 entries. His research has taken him into compilations of synonyms and antonyms, English-foreign lexicons, and other specialized reference works. A resident of Connecticut, Urdang spends half his time in England as a student of "the Queen's English" and the other half in America as a student of "Vice President's English." Not only students of words but average general readers will take delight in perusing the pages of this volume which eschews defining words everybody knows and gives attention to those uncommon coinages appearing in popular newspapers and magazines.

---



